FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-001
Tuesday
2 January 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-001 *2 January 1990*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Defense Ministry Enumerates Weapons Cuts *[TASS]* 1
USSR May Be Reducing Naval Presence in SRV *[Tokyo KYODO]* 1
Military Withdrawal From Hungary Continues *[TASS]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Spokesman Gerasimov Gives 29 Dec News Briefing 2
1989 Changes Reviewed *[TASS]* 2
Havel, Dubcek Congratulated *[Prague CTK]* 2
Aid to Romania *[TASS]* 3
Berlin Monument Desecration *[TASS]* 3
Honors for Stalin's Diplomat Vicitims *[TASS]* 3
Panama U.S. 'Test Range' *[TASS]* 4
U.S. Detention of Cubans *[TASS]* 4
Egyptian-Syrian Ties *[TASS]* 4
Kasparov Remark on Kuriles *[Moscow Radio]* 4
Rio Group Communique Cautions U.S. on Panama *[TASS]* 5
UN Vote Shows U.S. 'Gets Away With' Invasion *[IZVESTIYA 31 Dec]* 5
TASS Views 1989 as Year of 'Transition' 5
'Top Priority' Program Reviews 1989 Events *[Kuznetsov, Plekhanov on Moscow International]* 6
Aeroflot Changing To Meet IATA Standards *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 21 Dec]* 9
Correction to 'Top Priority' Views Panama 9

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

TASS Carries Bush's New Year's Message 10
Gorbachev's New Year's Address to U.S. *[Moscow TV]* 10
Bessmertnykh Summons U.S. Envoy About Panama *[TASS]* 11
Panama Shows 'Bush Doctrine' in Operation *[IZVESTIYA 30 Dec]* 11
USSR-U.S. Communication Channel Tested *[TASS]* 13
U.S. 'Titan-3' Rocket Launch Postponed *[TASS]* 14

China

Normalization of Ties With PRC Lauded *[PRAVDA 29 Dec]* 14
Jiang Zemin on Combating 'Bourgeois Liberalization' *[PRAVDA 30 Dec]* 15
Youth Paper Recalls Tiananmen Events *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 31 Dec]* 15

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Rogachev Discusses Cambodian Problem After Visit *[Moscow Radio]* 15
Cambodian Leaders Interviewed on Situation 16
Deputy Defense Minister *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 28 Dec]* 16
Hun Sen *[Moscow Radio]* 18

Near East & South Asia

Libya Issues Denial About Mercenaries in Romania *[IZVESTIYA 30 Dec]* 18
Special Envoy on Release of Soviet POWs *[TASS]* 19
Afghanistan's La'eq on 'Political Pluralism' *[Moscow TV]* 19

Commentary Views Iranian Reaction to Panama Attack *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 19
Amal-Hizballah Clashes in Lebanon Examined *[Andreyev on Moscow International]* 20
Economic Minister Katushev Ends Syrian Visit *[TASS]* 21
PLO's Policies Seen as 'Flexible, Constructive' *[PRAVDA 1 Jan]* 21

East Europe

Shevardnadze Invited To Visit Romania *[TASS]* 21
Visit Set for 'Next Weekend' *[Moscow International]* 22
Romania's Brucan on Former Leaders' Trial *[TASS]* 22
Romanian President Says Trust Growing *[Moscow TV]* 22
Romania's Bogdan on Improving Soviet Relations *[Moscow Radio]* 23
Bogdan on European Home *[IZVESTIYA 2 Jan]* 23
Romanian Government Holds First Session *[TASS]* 24
Romanian Premier Cited on Ties With Warsaw Pact *[IZVESTIYA 31 Dec]* 24
RCP Members Call for Disbandment of Party *[PRAVDA 1 Jan]* 25
Press Treatment of Ceausescu's Romania Hit *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Jan]* 26
Romanian New Year Holiday Preparations Described *[Moscow Radio]* 26
New Year's Scenes *[Moscow Radio]* 27
Bulgarian Paper Interviews Shevardnadze *[Sofia ZEMEDELSKO ZNAME 28 Dec]* 27
Albanians Urged To 'Follow Romania's Example' *[IZVESTIYA 2 Jan]* 28
CPCZ Leaders Thank Gorbachev for Greeting *[Moscow International]* 28
Supreme Soviet Wishes Havel Success in CSSR *[PRAVDA 31 Dec]* 28
Soviet Central Newspapers View New CSSR President 29
PRAVDA Profiles Havel *[30 Dec]* 29
IZVESTIYA Sees 'Great Vigor' *[2 Jan]* 30
'No Settling of Scores' Foreseen in CSSR *[IZVESTIYA 1 Jan]* 30
"Seven Days" Interviews CSSR's Dubcek *[Moscow TV]* 30
'Hooligans' Damage Soviet Gravestones in GDR *[TASS]* 31
PRAVDA Reports on 'Neofascist Trends' in GDR *[1 Jan]* 31

West Europe

Reportage on French Interior Minister's Visit 32
Joxe on Visit's Results *[TASS]* 32
Joxe, Bakatin Give News Conference *[Moscow Radio]* 32
'Vremya' Report *[Moscow TV]* 33
USSR-Spanish Trade Deal 'Blocked' by U.S. *[PRAVDA 28 Dec]* 34

Latin America & Caribbean

Further Reportage on Panama Developments 34
Vatican Embassy Situation Viewed *[TASS]* 34
'Worldwide Rejection' of Invasion *[Levchenko on Moscow Radio]* 35
Soviet UN Envoy Condemns U.S. *[Moscow Radio]* 35
UNGA Demands U.S. Withdrawal *[TASS]* 35
Servicemen 'Behaving Like Highwaymen' *[Deruga on Moscow Radio]* 36
IZVESTIYA Updates Situation *[1 Jan]* 37
U.S. Troops Occupy Nicaragua's Panama Embassy *[TASS]* 37
Nicaraguan Statement on Evacuation from Panama *[TASS]* 37
'Foreign Aircraft' Violate Nicaraguan Air Space *[TASS]* 38
Ortega on Near 'Fatal Conflict' With U.S. *[TASS]* 38
Cuba Marks Revolution's Anniversary 1 Jan *[Moscow Radio]* 38
Soviet Leadership Greets Castro *[PRAVDA 1 Jan]* 39
Yazov Greets Raul Castro *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Jan]* 39
Diplomat Gives TV Address *[Moscow TV]* 39
Castro's Criticism of U.S. Policy Cited *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Jan]* 40

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Congress of People's Deputies

Gorbachev Urges Reflection on Tbilisi Events *[IZVESTIYA 30 Dec]* 41
Deputies Assail Interregional Group Statement *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Dec]* 41
Correction to Ligachev Talk on Corruption *[Moscow TV]* 44

Political & Social

Gorbachev's Addresses Nation on New Year's Eve *[PRAVDA 1 Jan]* 44
Violent Disturbances Reported in Azerbaijan 45
Interior Ministry Cited *[TASS]* 45
1 Killed, 100 Reported Hurt *[AFP]* 46
Tension Following Attack *[Baku Radio]* 46
Situation Stabilized *[Baku Radio]* 46
New Dzhalal Abad Rayon Committee Chairman Elected *[Baku Radio]* 47
Azeris Demonstrate on Iranian Border *[AFP]* 47
Attack on Armenian Village in NKAO Reported *[Yerevan International]* 47
Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Session Begins 29 Dec *[Moscow Radio]* 48
Discusses Disturbances *[Moscow TV]* 48
Further on Session *[Baku Radio]* 48
Session Ends *[TASS]* 48
Opening of Social Research Institute Reported *[Baku Radio]* 49
Kirovabad City Renamed Gendzhe City *[Baku Radio]* 49
Azerbaijan Readopts Traditional Names *[TASS]* 49
Azerbaijan Automation Work 'Unsatisfactory' *[Baku Radio]* 49
Bakatin on Case Against Armenian Deputy *[ARMENPRES]* 50
Deputies Urge Supreme Soviet Debate on NKAO *[ARMENPRES]* 50
Diaspora Broadcasters Invited to Seminar *[Yerevan International]* 51
Closing of Armenian Chemical Plant Demanded *[Yerevan International]* 51
Uzbek Electoral Process Discussed *[PRAVDA VOSTOKA 24 Nov]* 51
Lithuanian CP 'Provisional' Central Committee Plenum 53
Endorses Gorbachev Report *[Moscow Radio]* 53
Proceedings Reported *[PRAVDA 2 Dec]* 53
'Uncertainty,' 'Confusion' Seen *[IZVESTIYA 31 Dec]* 53
Secretary Shved Interview *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Dec]* 54
Brazauskas Interview *[Vilnius Radio]* 54
Two Lithuanian Communist Party 'Trends' *[Moscow TV]* 56
Local Opinions Vary on Split in Lithuanian Party *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 31 Dec]* 57
Split Discussed *[Vilnius International]* 57
Lithuanians Cited on Independent Party *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 30 Dec]* 58
Lithuanian Parties Meet, Officials Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 58
Lithuanian Council of Ministers Registers Parties *[TASS]* 59
Lithuanian Aspirations Undercut By Economy *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 31 Dec]* 59
Uzbek Party Criticizes Lithuanian Breakaway *[TASS]* 60
Bolshevik Revolution Termed 'Death to Freedom' *[GIMTASIS KRASTAS No 45]* 60
Pitfalls of Baltic Independence Enumerated *[Orlov on TASS]* 62
German-Lithuanian Newspaper Published in Klaipeda *[TASS]* 63
Maltreatment of Estonian Draftees Claimed *[Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER 18 Dec]* 63
Prospective Estonian Parties Expound Goals *[IZVESTIYA 25 Dec]* 64
Estonian Social Democrats Discuss Program *[Tallinn Radio]* 64
Scientist Details Chernobyl's Consequences *[TASS]* 67
Belorussian Front Leader Critical of State *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 24 Nov]* 67
Archbishop Deplores Attempted Seizure of Church *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Dec]* 70
Delegates Speak at Leningrad Joint Plenum *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 23 Nov]* 70
More Delegates' Remarks *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 24 Nov]* 87
Journalists Offer Opinions on Draft Press Law *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 7 Dec]* 96
Editors, Journalists Union Articles *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 14 Dec]* 98

New Newspapers, Radio Station Launched 102
RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA *[TASS]* 102
Gorbachev Sends Congratulations *[Moscow Radio]* 102
PRAVDA Changes Look *[AFP]* 102
New Newspaper in Stavropol *[Moscow Radio]* 102
Art Awards Presented by 'Prizes Commission' 103
17 Authors Honored *[Moscow TV]* 103
Vlasov Presents Awards *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 30 Dec]* 103
TV Opinion Poll Views National Situation *[Moscow TV]* 103
Foreign Ministry Official Discussess Human Rights *[TASS]* 104
Ukrainian Catholics Charged with Strong-Arm Tactics *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 19 Nov]* 104

Defense Ministry Enumerates Weapons Cuts

LD0101102190 Moscow TASS in English 1011 GMT 1 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow January 1 TASS—The Soviet Defence Ministry circulated the following statement here on Monday:

In accordance with the Soviet-American Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, as of December 31, 1989, the Soviet Union has destroyed 1,498 medium and shorter range missiles (81.1 per cent of the initial number) and 555 launchers for such missiles (67.2 per cent). The United States has destroyed 451 missiles (53.3 per cent) and 92 launchers (31.8 per cent). In 1989, both sides completed the destruction of their shorter range missiles and launchers: the Soviet Union—OTR-22 and OTR-23, and the United States—Pershing-1A missiles.

Out of 79 Soviet missile operating bases 47 have been dismantled, and out of 9 American, three have been dismantled.

The dismantling and verification are carried out in strict compliance with the INF Treaty.

USSR May Be Reducing Naval Presence in SRV

OW3112100189 Tokyo KYODO in English 0923 GMT 31 Dec 89

[Text] Tokyo, Dec. 31 KYODO—The Soviet Union may have started reduction of its naval forces stationed in Cam Ranh Bay in Vietnam, possibly as part of President Mikhail Gorbachev's global peace initiative, Japanese Defense Agency sources said Sunday.

The sources said that this speculation was backed by the Japanese Maritime Self-Defense Force's watch on the movement of Soviet naval ships around Japan which indicated more northward moves from Vietnam.

The north-bound vessels, which increased after summer, outnumbered ones which headed south from the Soviet Fareast region by more than 10 ships during 1989, according to the sources.

Defense Agency sources also said the Air Self-Defense Force confirmed on December 19 a total of 12 Soviet reconnaissance and bombardier planes flying in a formation toward the Soviet Fareast.

This number is equivalent to about half the estimated number of Soviet military aircraft stationed in the Cam Ranh Bay area, they said.

The Soviet Union started to strengthen its military deployment in the area, a key strategic point in the South China Sea, in the early 1980s and now some 25 naval vessels from Vladivostok are believed to be permanently stationed there.

However, there are no signs that indicate a change in the Soviet naval buildup in the Pacific on the whole. The Soviet Pacific Fleet conducted drills of the same scale and frequency as in previous years, the sources said.

The Soviet Union can redeploy naval units to Vietnam at any time as base facilities have been greatly expanded in the Cam Ranh Bay area, they said.

Experts in the Defense Agency said they do not see a complete Soviet military withdrawal from Vietnam in the foreseeable future.

The experts said the moves will not directly influence Japan's defense policy for the time being as they think the Soviets would continue to use Cam Ranh Bay facilities to maintain the Soviet military presence in the Indian Ocean.

Military Withdrawal From Hungary Continues

LD2912130489 Moscow TASS in English 1251 GMT 29 Dec 89

[Text] Budapest December 29 TASS—According to the Soviet Government's decision on unilateral cuts in the Soviet Armed Forces in 1989, a tank division, a training tank regiment, an air fighters regiment and some other units have been withdrawn from Hungary.

All in all, over 10,000 men, 470 tanks, over 200 artillery and mortar installations and more than 3,000 trucks and other vehicles were withdrawn, Colonel General M. Burlakov, commander of the Soviet Southern Army Group, told the Hungarian MTI news agency.

Training bases, barracks and apartment houses have been transferred to the Hungarian side. Due to the Soviet withdrawal from the Hungarian-Austrian border area, a so-called confidence zone was created there.

Residents of Budapest southern boroughs are no longer disturbed by the sound of flying planes: An air regiment has been withdrawn from Tokol.

The recently published decision of the Soviet Government envisages the withdrawal of air and motorized infantry regiments, two tank battalions and other units from Hungary in 1990, totalling 6,000 men, over 40 planes, 120 tanks, almost 180 armored vehicles and over 400 trucks.

When making this decision, the government took into account the request of Debrecen residents to remove the Soviet air unit that is now located near residential area.

Spokesman Gerasimov Gives 29 Dec News Briefing

1989 Changes Reviewed

LD2912205589 Moscow TASS in English 2021 GMT 29 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 29 TASS—The world has become a different place in 1989. We have every right to look back in astonishment—the international landscape has changed beyond recognition. This is how Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Genadiy Gerasimov commented on the results of 1989 at a press briefing here today.

Stressing first of all developments in the Soviet Union, Gerasimov said the outgoing year witnessed the first free elections in decades in the Soviet Union and the opening of "parliamentary classes in which deputies are learning, under conditions of open political argument, to reach accord and move ahead".

The Soviet Union has scored considerable success in normalising its military-industrial complex: Soviet Armed Forces have been cut by 265,000 men and military spending by 6.3 billion roubles.

The processes of perestroyka and renewal in the Soviet Union, Gerasimov said, have evoked a sharply increased interest of the world community and the mass media in the USSR. He told journalists that the volume of information from Moscow about life in the Soviet Union has grown almost three-fold, the number of foreign journalists increased from 453 to 580 people and 55 new press bureaus were opened in Moscow in 1989.

In Eastern Europe events have taken place that are described as a democratic revolution, he went on to say. The Berlin Wall collapsed and the Brandenburg Gates were thrown open. Developments in Czechoslovakia made it possible to leave behind the sad heritage of 1868 [as received]. Processes of democratisation are underway in various forms in Hungary, Poland and Bulgaria. Changes in Romania met support by the Soviet Union.

In Western Europe new steps were taken towards economic integration, towards "Europe-1993," he stressed. The Soviet Union is also to a certain extent participating in this movement after the signing of an agreement with European communities, he said.

Among the important events of the year in Soviet-U.S. relations the Soviet spokesman recalled the meetings of the Soviet and American foreign ministers in Wyoming, the Malta summit and the general acceleration of developments that even determined optimistic outlooks.

"We are already talking about a transition from mutual understanding to interaction between the Soviet Union and the United States and about joint advancement to a more stable world. These gains should be protected against the recurrence of old positions- of-strength approaches, against overloads of the type of the shameful Panama operation", Gerasimov said.

The Soviet spokesman noted the striving for new democratic heights in Latin America, singling out changes in Chile, where a democratically elected president will head the state for the first time since 1973.

Expressing hope that the new year, 1990, will develop at double speed along the world policy directions outlined in 1989, Gerasimov stressed that "it is very important to develop further the process on the European continent, to conclude and agreement on a radical reduction of conventional armed forces and armaments in Europe".

He also pointed out the need to further expand economic cooperation of European countries with the aim of "creating in future a single structure of European economic interaction".

Gerasimov described as good the prospects for Soviet-American relations, noting that the Soviet Union "does not view the United States as an enemy and will in no case attack it". Soviet-American relations in the coming year will be highlighted by the signing of an agreement on the 50 per cent cut of strategic nuclear arms, the ratification of the protocols to the so-called threshold treaties of 1974-1976 on curtailing underground nuclear weapon tests and a rapid advancement towards the complete ban and elimination of chemical weapons, the Soviet spokesman said.

The Soviet Union is also looking forward to the beginning of serious talks on the reduction of naval arms.

"We hope," Gerasimov said, "for the further development of trade between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the signing of a trade agreement granting the Soviet Union most favoured nation treatment, the development and consoldation of relations between the two countries in all fields".

The Soviet Union also hopes, he said, that the New Year will become critical in the settlement of the regional conflicts in the Middle East, Central America, Cambodia and around Afghanistan.

Havel, Dubcek Congratulated

LD2912170489 Prague CTK in English 1529 GMT 29 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow Dec 29 (CTK correspondent)—The Soviet leadership has sent telegrams of congratulations to Vaclav Havel on his election new Czechoslovak president and to Alexander Dubcek on his election chairman of the Federal Assembly, and wished them success in the high state functions, Soviet spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov announced here today.

The Soviet Union respects the choice of the Czechoslovak people and is convinced that Soviet-Czechoslovak relations, cooperation and bonds of alliance will further develop in the spirit of friendship, mutual understanding and good neighbourly relations, Gerasimov said.

Aid to Romania

LD2912151489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1410 GMT 29 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 29 Dec (TASS)—The Soviet Union actively supports the UN General Assembly's call for urgently lending humanitarian aid to Romania, Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, stated at a briefing today. The resolution adopted at the 44th UN General Assembly session, which urgently called on all states, international financial institutions, and UN organizations to lend urgent humanitarian aid to Romania, reflects the international community's feelings of sympathy and support for the Romanian people's just cause, he said.

Gennadiy Gerasimov noted, welcoming its unanimous approval, the USSR notes with satisfaction that broad new possibilities are opening up at the present time for Soviet-Romanian cooperation for the mutual benefit of our peoples and in the interests of lasting peace and stability.

The Soviet diplomat reported that after reports had arrived on numerous human casualties and the large number of wounded in Romania, the Soviet Red Cross and Red Crescent Society had undertaken measures to lend emergency aid to the victims. In Moldavia and the Ukraine, government commissions have been set up to lend aid to the Romanian people. The USSR Council of Ministers is coordinating the work aid rendering.

He noted that as early as 23 December the Red Cross had put together a cargo of aid that contained sanitary bags, surgical instruments, bandages, and medicines weighing about 1.5 tonnes. Besides this, deliveries of appropriate cargoes are being made by rail and road transportation through the Soviet Red Cross. The USSR Ministry of Health has dispatched two aircraft and two railcars carrying medicines and medical equipment to Romania. They contain, primarily, bandages, antibiotics, blood substitutes, and blood preparations.

In Moldavia and the Ukraine, accounts have been announced with the republican Red Cross societies, to which citizens of these republics have been able to make financial donations to help the victims, the Foreign Ministry spokesman said. Industry and food goods for delivery to Romania have been accepted at local soviets' executive committees. Medical establishments to receive the injured have been prepared in the immediate border zones (Kishinev, Lvov, and other cities). Three centers and 50 sections for blood transfusion have been organized. Several tens of railcars carrying food and medicines already have been sent to Romania from Moldavia and the Ukraine.

Berlin Monument Desecration

LD2912143189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1336 GMT 29 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 29 Dec (TASS)—At a briefing today, Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, called the defilement of the monument to the Soviet serviceman and liberator in Treptower Park in Berlin a "monstrous crime," deserving the most severe condemnation. The preliminary results of the investigation, he said, point to the involvement of neo-Nazi forces from West Berlin in this act of vandalism committed in the early hours of 29 December.

The Soviet spokesman stressed that the GDR government has expressed decisive condemnation of this anti-Soviet nationalistic act aimed at undermining the friendship of the peoples of the USSR and the GDR.

Barbaric actions have been committed against the world-famous symbol of the great victory over fascist Germany and of the liberation of the German people from the Nazi plague, Gennadiy Gerasimov pointed out. The bright memory of millions of Soviet soldiers who gave their lives in the name of freedom has been insulted.

This monstrous crime, he stressed, is a disturbing signal for all who hate facism, a signal calling for vigilance, for a rebuff to the forces of neo-Nazism and right-wing extremism which pose a threat to the ideals of peace and democracy.

Honors for Stalin's Diplomat Vicitims

LD2912142289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1320 GMT 29 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 29 Dec (TASS)—At the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the unveiling took place today of a memorial plaque and a book commemorating the staff of the Soviet diplomatic service who fell victim to the repressions of the thirties, forties, and early fifties. This was announced at a news briefing today by Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The solemn ceremony was attended by USSR Foreign Minster Eduard Shevardnadze, members of the Collegium, and other officials of the Soviet foreign policy department.

Gennadiy Gerasimov noted that a special commission was at work in the ministry under the chairmanship of USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Valentin Nikoforov, discovering the names of repressed diplomatic and consular officials, diplomatic couriers, and staff of the administrative and technical services. The names of 113 repressed leading officials have already been established. Among the dead included in that figure are seven deputy foreign ministers (people's commissars) 28 ambassadors, 30 section heads, and 28 heads of consular missions. "Such was the concentrated blow delivered against the cadres of Soviet diplomats," the Foreign Ministry spokesman said. "Very many technical staff died too:

drivers, for example, who were branded as agents of foreign intelligence services."

Gennadiy Gerasimov stressed that the fate of many officials dismissed from their work in the Ministry (people's commissariat) of Foreign Affairs between 1934 and 1953 was still unknown. Many of them probably became victims of the repressions.

So far, the names of only 140 repressed diplomats and workers in the ministry's adminstration and technical services have been assembled in a memorial book, the Soviet diplomat said. The work of discovering the names of the repressed staff of the Soviet diplomatic service will be continued, he emphasized.

Panama U.S. 'Test Range'

LD2912171389 Moscow TASS in English 1622 GMT 29 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 29 TASS—The United States used its newest fighter bombers, based on Stealth technology, in its military actions in Panama, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said at a news briefing here today.

Gennadiy Gerasimov said "This is not the first time the United States turns small countries into a test range for testing up-to- date weapons and surprise attack methods.

"The experience gained is used in the work on a whole series of Stealth planes—the strategic B-2 bomber, two types of tactical fighters and the A-12 attack plane intended for deployment on attack aircraft carriers."

The spokesman said Stealth planes that are difficult to detect by radars and thus capable of stealthily crossing borders and approaching targets, "seriously destabilise the military situation at both strategic and tactical levels.

"This increases countries' mistrust and reduces their confidence in the reliability of their security, which, in turn, impedes efforts to improve the international situation."

Gerasimov said the Pentagon is now engaged in "large-scale work on Stealth planes, boasting about their 'invulnerability' in strikes against 'undesirable' forces in Third World countries.

"This raises a logical question: What are the U.S. motives in making some Third World countries abandon their intentions to increase their security with the help of up-to-date anti-aircraft defence means, including fighters and anti-aircraft missiles?"

U.S. Detention of Cubans

LD2912143989 Moscow TASS in English 1430 GMT 29 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 29 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov today described the detention of Cuban diplomats by U.S. servicemen who are continuing the blockade of the Cuban Embassy in Panama as a violation of international law and the status of diplomatic representatives.

The spokesman recalled at a press briefing here today that Article 29 of the Vienna Convention says that the personality of the diplomatic agent is inviolable. Under this article, diplomats cannot be arrested or detained in any form.

"It is clear that such actions by the U.S. occupation forces only exacerbate the situation engendered by the American invasion of Sovereign Panama," Gerasimov said.

Egyptian-Syrian Ties

LD2912165889 Moscow TASS in English 1520 GMT 29 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 29 TASS—The restoration of diplomatic relations between Egypt and Syria has been received with profound satisfaction in the Soviet Union, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov said at a briefing today.

In our firm opinion, he stressed, this will help further consolidate the Arab ranks and exert a positive impact on the situation in the Arab world and the region as a whole.

The step taken by the two states, friendly to the Soviet Union, towards each other is in line with the USSR's policy aimed at consolidating in international relations the principles of new political thinking, mutual understanding, confidence and goodneighbourliness between all members of the international community, including in the Middle East, the Soviet diplomat said.

The USSR invariably advocates the normalisation of relations between all Arab countries, consolidation of the Arab ranks to promote solution of their problems.

The Soviet Union reaffirms its readiness to most constructively cooperate with Egypt and Syria in bringing durable peace to the (?Middle East), Gerasimov said.

Kasparov Remark on Kuriles

LD2912231989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2024 GMT 29 Dec 89

[Text] Today at a briefing, USSR Foreign Ministry Spokeksman Gerasimov briefly summarized results of events that have taken place in the international arena this year.

Among the multitude of issues examined was this one: What is the attitude toward Gari Kasparov's thoughts, which he expressed in an interview for PLAYBOY magazine? The [chess] champion announced that it is possible to think up masses of fantastic and incredible ideas. Recently, the following thought occurred to him: Why should we not sell the Kurile Islands to Japan? We

could sell Mongolia to China. This is, of course, an amusing incident, but not such a harmless one, after all.

The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman stated to journalists that such fantastic and incredible ideas have nothing in common with the official position of our country.

Rio Group Communique Cautions U.S. on Panama

LD3012082289 Moscow TASS in English 0811 GMT 30 Dec 89

[Text] Mexico City December 30 TASS—The member-countries of the "Rio de Janeiro Group" urged the U.S. occupation troops in Panama to respect the norms of international law that guarantee the immunity of diplomatic personnel and missions.

A Mexican Foreign Ministry communique circulated here on Friday pointed out that the governments of Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela, Colombia, Mexico, Peru and Uruguay made this demand because they are deeply concerned over the actions of foreign troops used for intervention in Panama". [quotation mark as received]

Those actions limit free communication and hamper the activities of diplomatic mission the Rio Group member-states pointed out.

Having pointed to the difficulties in operation of some diplomatic missions in Panama is respect for international law is an indispensable condition for their normal activities.

The governments of the seven Latin American countries reject any action that can infringe the immunity of diplomats accredited in Panama, the immunity which is provided for by the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic and Consumer [as received] Relations.

UN Vote Shows U.S. 'Gets Away With' Invasion

PM0201102190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Shalnev dispatch: "Condemnation Not Unanimous. United States Gets Away With Panama Invasion"]

[Text] New York—However much one would like to say that the world community had condemned the U.S. invasion of Panama in the most resolute fashion, such a statement would, regrettably, be inaccurate. In a vote at the UN General Assembly on a rather restrained resolution drafted by Cuba and Nicaragua and expressing "profound regret" over the invasion, only 75 countries voted in favor, 20 countries voted against, 40 abstained, and the rest preferred not to take part in the vote at all.

In other words, the United States has gotten away with an act that violated documents of international law. I do not intend to speculate as to why this happened, why—despite quite intensive lobbying—the draft resolution failed to win the support which might have been expected. Even the fact that the draft that was put to the vote was somewhat milder than the original version was no help. In any case, the resolution would have changed nothing in practice: As is well known, General Assembly resolutions are not binding. Moreover, the aims of the U.S. invasion of Panama had been achieved: A regime which will now feel bound to Washington has been installed in the country.

Incidentally, one of those who spoke at the General Assembly Friday was Leon Abadi—until a few days ago the representative of the Noriega government, and now representing the Endara government. In the opinion of experts, this can be considered a step toward the recognition of the new regime within the United Nations.

But, nonetheless, resolute and scathing criticism was heard in the Assembly. Soviet Permanent Representative Aleksandr Belonogov stated that through its actions the United States is threatening peace and security in the Central American and neighboring regions and forcing the world to ask itself the by-no-means-rhetorical question of who will be the next target for the use of force. By invading Panama, Washington—as the Ghanaian representative put it—has threatened the "future viability of the United Nations Organization." The events in Panama, the Ghanaian delegate said, are "digging the United Nations' grave." And yet, quite recently—just a month ago—the United States was the co-author of a General Assembly resolution on the need to enhance the international community's effectiveness in safeguarding and strengthening peace and international security....

TASS Views 1989 as Year of 'Transition'

LD2912183889 Moscow TASS in English 1738 GMT 29 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 29 TASS—The outgoing year 1989 can rightly be described as the year of confidence and transition from confrontation to interaction and large-scale cooperation in Europe, a year when the psychology of military thinking was being decisively abandoned, Valeriy Krasnov, deputy chief of the Second European Department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, told TASS.

"Our appraisal coincides with that of most of our West European partners," Krasnov said. "The year 1989 saw a turn toward the laying down of the foundations of a new European zone, of Europe's advance towards unity. All this has become possible due to a cardinal change in the international situation in Europe and the world."

The Soviet diplomat believes these processes were prompted above all by the perestroyka policies in the Soviet Union, the effectiveness of the Soviet foreign policy aimed at shaping international relations of a new type.

Krasnov said West European leaders and peoples of European countries took a fresh look of the processes in

the Soviet Union and prospects for interaction with the USSR in international affairs.

It is important that European countries are now motivated not so much by the fact of the division into the military-political alliances, as by European interests, respect for common human values, the striving to preserve peace and stability.

There are virtually no international problems on which Europe does not declare in a constructive spirit and for the solution of which it is not looking. This applies to problems of the Middle East, the South of Africa, the Cambodian settlement and others.

At the same time the representative of the Soviet Foreign Ministry noted that alarming processes continue in Europe.

There are still forces in Europe, above all in NATO, that are unaccustomed to and unprepared for stabilisation and peaceful development.

Therefore they warn against too swift a movement of the East and the West to meet each other half-way and believe that it would be premature to include naval and space armaments into the negotiating process.

There is a need for political will and consolidation of all the parties interested in turning Europe into a zone of peace and security in order to overcome the difficulties, to preserve and speed up positive tendencies in the European development, the diplomat said.

'Top Priority' Program Reviews 1989 Events

LD3012054589 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 23 Dec 89

["Top Priority" program presented by Pavel Kuznetsov with Sergey Plekhanov, deputy director of the United States and Canada Studies Institute]

[Text] [Kuznetsov] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen. I am Pavel Kuznetsov presenting Top Priority. Our numbers have been reduced because of influenza, so only the strongest survive—and one of the strongest men I've ever met is Sergey Plekhanov, who is deputy director of the United States and Canada Studies Institute here in Moscow. Sergey, let's discuss the only topic that's suitable for this moment, for this occasion; that is, looking back at 1989. The downfall and the subsequent swift execution of the Romanian dictator, Nicolae Ceausescu, kept, er, [changes thought] and it's been an extremely stormy year for Eastern Europe and it'll most certainly go down in history as a year of the triumph of democracy.

The events in Eastern Europe were obviously set off by the Soviet policy of perestroyka started by Mikhail Gorbachev in 1985. One of the principles in foreign policy on which this new Soviet vision and policy rest is the one proclaimed by our leader in 1988 in New York when he spoke before the United Nations General Assembly, and the principle is freedom of choice is universal, which allows no exceptions, meaning—or, as I understand it—is that there will never again be any use of force at home or abroad.

Now my question, and that's only my question, is: There are two conflicting points of view. One of them is, and I share it, that 1989 saw the end of Stalinism, while Western scholars insist that that was the end of communism. What is your reaction?

[Plekhanov] I don't think you can call it the end of communism because, in my view, communism has never existed. What has existed and what does exist is a group of communist parties in various countries which have been pursuing their political goals. Their ultimate goal is the construction of communism, but everybody recognizes that this is some distant goal.

[Kuznetsov] Yes, but this is exactly what Mikhail Gorbachev told the delegates of the Congress of People's Deputies, saying I am a communist but as a goal...

[Plekhanov, interrupting] Yeah, sure.

[Kuznetsov] But as an objective, it's a very distant one. Communism, building a communist, a perfect society, it's something far away from where we are now.

[Plekhanov] Right, but the fact is that across the world, especially in the West, the socialist countries, what we call socialist countries, are usually called or used to be called communist countries, meaning countries in which communists hold power. Now we've seen very drastic changes in those countries and what is important is that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which is the biggest communist party and the first party to ever hold power in a country, became a catalyst of these changes. So if this is the demise of communism, then why are the communists in the forefront of this demolition work? I mean, are they just [words indistinct] or maybe this is not the demise of communism, maybe this is a radical transformation of communism...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] Into a multiparty system, because according to latest reports that keep coming from Romania, the top officials of the provisional government have said that the party's role isn't going to play, to play any role in the future of Romanian society. It'll exist only as part of the multiparty structure that's going to be created in that country.

[Plekhanov] Well, you know there's nothing in the doctrine of socialism or of communism which makes the one-party system the only possible form of government. The Soviet Government, the first Soviet Government, consisted of two parties and it was not the communists that were responsible for the demise of the two-party government. The other party rebelled and they staged an armed uprising, and in a number of socialist countries there have been several parties. Of course, it was not a really multiparty system, so the experience of multiparty systems is something new in socialist countries. In

Poland I think they are further advanced down this road than in other countries, but I think we are going to have a number of viable and democratic multiparty systems in socialist countries. You see, the question is what kind of socialism, what is associated with socialism, what used to be associated with socialism; it's something which was—if it was socialism—it was some primitive and distorted and very underdeveloped form of socialism. What we are now trying to build is democratic socialism, humane socialism, a new model which will be in many ways so different from what used to be associated with this name that you might just call it a different system.

[Kuznetsov] But would you agree with my assessment of that principle that by denouncing the use of force, by breaking away with Stalinism at home and abroad, we are not going to use, to resort to military force any more. I think that there's an indication of that when we turned down a French and American offer, or suggestion or proposal, to intervene militarily in Romania, and I think that revulsion with that is so strong that we refused even to consider that offer from the French foreign minister, Mr Dumas.

[Plekhanov] Well, I think that discussion was rather artificial because nobody in Romania, I mean the Romanian Government, the new Romanian Government, (?didn't ask) for military assistance, and in this particular case I think even with the noblest of goals it would not have been right for the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact to intervene.

[Kuznetsov] What about volunteers? I understand that members of the secret police Securitate continue to resist. They did not follow the ultimatum to turn, to lay down their arms, and they continue to hunt for the members of the provisional government who ride in armored vehicles. Do you foresee a possibility of such a request and perhaps sending volunteers, not only from the Soviet Union but I understand Hungary may be willing to go along with such a proposal, perhaps some other countries.

[Plekhanov] Well, so far the Romanian Government indicates and emphasizes that they are perfectly able to handle the situation...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] They are firmly in control.

[Plekhanov] So, it's not, it's not that they don't have the equipment or the people to handle it. It's just that nature of the problem when you're dealing with a well-prepared group of terrorists; you can't clean it up quickly. It will have, it's like, you know, dealing with cockroaches, you can't do it in one swoop.

[Kuznetsov] In 1989, this country took thorough steps which in my view have propelled it further down the road of a painful reevaluation of our distant and not so distant past, and I mean the denunciation of the Staling-Hitler pacts of 1939 and the secret protocols attached to it, which led the the annexation of the Baltic states, the Baltic republics, and the division of Poland. Then there was the condemanation of a decision to send Soviet troops in Afghanistan, which was taken by four men who were named during the Congress of People's Deputies, during the second session of that body—they were Mr Brezhnev, Gromyko, Andropov, and Ustinov—and also we condemned the use of military force against peaceful demonstrators in Tbilisi, Georgia, last April. Now this, those gaping holes in our history, with this bleeding and wounded conscience, I think—what is holding our country together and hopefully will continue to hold it together, at least in the near future?

[Plekhanov] Well, what should hold us together is the truth. I don't think that we have now gaping holes. I think we've filled some gaping holes in our history by telling people the truth about what happened, about the crimes and mistakes of the past, and I think that a nation should feel better ultimately knowing the truth than in a state when you lull yourself with all kinds of lies.

The second thing that should hold us together is the idea of freedom. We are amidst, you know, a large wave of liberation in socialist countries, and this liberation is good for socialists. This is something without which socialism, real socialism, cannot exist. And I think people value that. They value the results of democratization in the political area, in the spiritual area. These things are vital to normal human existence. And so far as people feel that there is a movement forward, that we are trying to build a new model of society based on freedom, based on democracy, based on people's self-government and people's ability to build a society according to their likes and needs, I think that that is the main glue that holds us together. I think stopping now as some conservative-minded people suggest, stopping now and having a pause, just looking around and taking stock would be wrong. And that's not what the people are demanding; they're demanding full speed ahead.

[Kuznetsov] I believe that the tragic events in Romania and also the U.S. invasion of Panama, whatever the motives, whatever the reasons, have somewhat eclipsed another event of major importance in my view, and I refer to the Soviet-U.S. summit off the coast of Malta. We, the two of us, we were both out there covering the summit and I think that 1989 will go down in history. We already discussed this issue some time ago and we said that the Cold War was buried on the bottom of the Mediterranean Sea. Perhaps, therefore, the year of 1989 will go down as the last nail driven into the coffin of the Cold War. (?But I am) very well aware of the fact that there are so many problems that are still unresolved. What are those urgent issues that we have to tackle jointly with the United States, with Western Europe, with other countries and members of the United Nations next year? I understand it's a very broad agenda that I've just outlined, but what are the most important things we have to settle, to solve?

[Plekhanov] I think the next year...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] Arms control? [words indistinct]

[Plekhanov] Yes, [words indistinct] disarmament. And if you look at the agenda for next year, arms reduction issues loom very large. Decisions have been taken this year, very important decisions in the area of strategic arms reduction, of conventional arms reductions, in Europe and both sides seem to be closer to each other on the major points in those areas than ever before. So there is a good opportunity for really moving very far ahead in this area, in the area of demilitarizing East-West relations.

[Kuznetsov] In other words, you say that—what you mean is that we have to supplement political changes with [words indistinct] in disarmament and arms control.

[Plekhanov] That's right. It was always...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] (?nuclear), of course.

[Plekhanov] Right, it was always difficult to deal with arms control issues in a situation when the main structure of the Cold War, main (?moods) of the Cold War, were still in existence. Now that the Cold War is over and the structures stand out there in contrast to where the world is going, it will be much easier to dismantle them, to destroy them and that's why, I think, the auguries are very good for arms reduction in the year of 1990. It could very well go down as the year of disarmament. Also, it could go down in history as the year of much broader and more intensive East-West economic cooperation. The United States has taken a decision to remove some of the longstanding obstacles from the path of East-West trade and the East, the socialist countries, seem to be better prepared and more willing to engage in intensive intercourse, economic intercourse, with the West. So we may see major progress in that area as well. And also there will be a Helsinki Two.

[Kuznetsov] We should, yes, but we should (?read) as a minor snag or a major snag in this arms control business, and what I mean is that it was very logical to pursue arms control when there were two military blocs opposing each other in Europe armed to the teeth, but now, basically, most Western military analysts agree that, are in consensus that the Warsaw Treaty is no longer a viable or strong military treaty. They cannot imagine, say, Hungary sending troops against or intervening on orders from the Soviet Union or Czechoslovakian or Polish troops doing the same. The reasoning, the rationale is that why [word indistinct] in this situation. The Soviets, I mean the Soviet bloc, has virtually disintegrated.

[Plekhanov] I don't agree that it has disintegrated. It's a much looser organization now than it used to be and it's in for major reform because the Warsaw Treaty, the current state of the Warsaw Treaty, reflects the reality which has already gone. The new relationship evolving between the Soviet Union and its allies will find it reflections in new structures, new procedures within the Warsaw Treaty. But I think the need for a treaty is recognized, not only by the Soviet Union but by many of its allies as well, because it is a stabilizing factor and I think it's a good idea to view the treaty just as the North Atlantic Treaty, to view the two blocs in Europe as vehicles for orderly, peaceful change toward a common European home.

(?Those) structures can be used for a different purpose.

[Kuznetsov] In other words, as long as there are intercontinental ballistic missiles on both sides capable of destroying each other in both parts of the world—I mean East and West, and now I am referring to these two parts of the world—arms control will be one of the most topical issues on the international agenda.

That's what you mean. Let's turn again to our domestic events, and as time is running out on us. The Soviet agenda for 1990 (?is) going to be very full. We are going to discuss and perhaps adopt such laws as those on property, dealing with property, freedom of the press, and land. There are also—we'll discuss the role of the Communist Party in Soviet society. We are going to have the 28th Communist Party Congress, which will convene ahead of schedule because of a decision of Lithuanian communists to break away, to split ranks with the CPSU. Now would you agree with my view that if our economy does not improve, if it continues to mark time, if living standards continue to fall, the eyes of the world may well focus on us because of potential trouble, turmoil, and perhaps violence in this country?

[Plekhanov] It will be a difficult year and everybody is expecting, is hoping that the economy will pick up and that we have already hit the rock bottom and there is no way to move except up. Hopefully, and we're keeping our fingers crossed, but it may be that the economy will not improve in the immediate future and then we're going to have exacerbated political difficulties, but even though I don't think that it's a situation where we would not have been able to handle the problems. I think that the main thing is to keep steady on this road of democratization. I think that democracy is the best way of dealing with any problem that a nation faces. So long as there is glasnost, there is openness, there is an ability to air your grievances, to discuss them in a open (?forum) to compare the view and to work out political solutions, you can overcome most of the difficulties that you have to deal with And there seems to be a determination [words indistinct] I'm sure a determination on the part of Mikhail Gorbachev and the leadership of the Soviet Union to keep true to democratization.

[Kuznetsov] To wrap up this program, two-man show actually, we have 30 seconds. If you were to address a crowd, a Soviet or international crowd, your message, what kind of message would you do? Not to panic, to get patient, just to wait, or to get prepared for a period of austerity in the Soviet Union, or to be optimistic? What would be your message? A very brief message.

[Plekhanov] Let's get to work.

[Kuznetsov] Thank you, Sergey Plekhanov. I am Pavel Kuznetsov, your host on Top Priority, wishing all of you good health, happiness, and the best in your endeavors.

Aeroflot Changing To Meet IATA Standards

PM2712154389 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 21 Dec 89 p 3

[Report by V. Yunisov: "Aeroflot: Forecast for the Future"]

[Text] There was a briefing at the USSR Foreign Ministry yesterday concerning Aeroflot's joining the International Air Transport Association [IATA].

It has taken the best part of half a century, so to speak, for our state airline to decide that it should join the international air community. The point is that IATA was formed back in 1945 and is an international nongovernmental organization that brings together 187 airlines in various countries.

What does IATA actually do?

In 1979, when structural changes took place in the association, its activities fell into two spheres: sectoral activity and tariff coordination. The former includes technical, legal, and financial matters, flight safety, airport development, and navigation. The latter includes establishing and coordinating tariffs, taxes, and charges. Now, it was announced at the briefing, one of Aeroflot's major tasks is to bring the Civil Aviation Ministry's normative documents into line with IATA demands and standards. One senior ministry official, addressing the briefing, said that as of 1 January 1990 it is authorized, with Soviet Government approval, to sell transport operations to foreign airlines. But, he stressed, this is on a reciprocal basis. In other words, if a particular IATA member country farms out a domestic line to Aeroflot, we will give it a similar opportunity in the USSR. But the question is: How does the passenger flying, for example, to the Urals on a Pan American aircraft pay—in rubles or dollars?

Correction to 'Top Priority' Views Panama

LD2912205389

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "'Top Priority' Views Panama, German Reunification" published in the 28 December 1989 Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 3: Paragraph one, line three, and throughout item, change "Andrey Korchunov" to "Andrey Kortunov" (correcting name)

United States & Canada

TASS Carries Bush's New Year's Message

LD0101171690 Moscow TASS in English 1704 GMT 1 Jan 90

[Text] Washington January 1 TASS—Follows full text of American President George Bush's New Year address to the Soviet Union:

On behalf of the American people, my wife Barbara, and my family, I bring you our warmest greetings.

A new year is dawning around the world, the first year of the last decade of the 20th Century. And as the world looks back to nine decades of war, of strife, of suspicion, let us also look forward to a new century, and a new millennium, of peace, freedom and prosperity.

Of course, there are no maps to lead us where we are going, to this new world of our own making. We can find our way only through cooperation beginning with a candid dialogue. It is in pursuit of such a dialogue that I met your president, Mikhail Gorbachev, near the island-nation of Malta. Let me share with you some of matters we discussed.

First, we agreed to redouble our efforts to diminish the horrible threat from weapons of mass destruction, and to pursue, with other nations, an agreement to reduce conventional forces in Europe.

Second, we talked about ways we can end regional conflicts and alleviate the terrible toll in human suffering they bring.

Third, I want to assure you, as I did your president, that the West seeks no advantage from the extraordinary changes underway in the East.

We talked about the magnificent efforts of the people of Eastern Europe to find a free and democratic future. And I told your president that I support the dynamic process of reform in the Soviet Union. We will work together to reduce barriers to trade, investment and the free movement of goods and ideas.

In these ways—and as your economic reforms take place—the entry of the Soviet Union into the global market can be advanced, an historic goal that, once achieved, can improve the life of every Soviet citizen.

But it is our belief that lasting peace and prosperity comes from a respect for human rights and the sharing of democratic values that are deeply rooted in the human spirit. Your own Leo Tolstoy said that if our hearts are empty, no law or political reform can fill them. The real law lives within our hearts.

These values are not exclusively American or Western. They are not the possession of any people or any domain. They belong to all men and women, through all time, and in all places. They are the inalienable rights of man.

Of course, much remains to be done. But the progress of the past year gives me confidence that we are heading in the right direciton. In this, President Gorbachev has been a good partner in peace.

Given the warn-torn history of this century, we should redouble our efforts to forge a new century of peace and freedom. Our nations have produced Abraham Lincoln, Leo Tolstoy, Martin Luther King, and Andrey Sakharov.

We have persevered as allies in a terrible war. The challenges we face today are no less daunting, but with the goodwill and determination on both sides I am confident our two peoples will be equal to the task.

Thank you, God bless you, and have a happy New Year.

Gorbachev's New Year's Address to U.S.

LD0101162990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1600 GMT 1 Jan 90

[Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's New Year's address to the U.S.; date and place not given—recorded]

[Text] Dear citizens of the United States of America,

I greet you on behalf of the Soviet people and convey the words of hope to you. The year 1990 can and must bring nearer a genuinely peaceful period of world history.

There still are hesitations, wait-and-see attitudes, doubts and suspicions. But all this only reaffirms the crucial nature of the current situation. The entire world proceeds ahead. It wants happiness, freedom and prosperity. And it would be naive, senseless and dangerous to try to thwart this aspiration for a better future.

We are deeply convinced that an epoch of peace is feasible. It seems that we, the Soviet Union and the United States, have already made a choice, a choice in favor of cooperation.

During the Malta meeting, President Bush and I agreed that it was essential to get away from the cold war and, this means abandoning the cold war instruments as well, so that 1990 and subsequent years could open up a period of genuine cooperation before us.

In that case, in an atmosphere of greater trust we would begin to build a world which rules out subversive action, pressure, interference and armed invasions that do no credit either to weapons or politics.

We in the Soviet Union have begun to advance toward such a future. This goal is served by our perestroyka. But we are convinced that all societies existing on Earth are in need of reasonable transformation.

Philosophers and historians maintain that the end of any century creates a special psychological atmosphere that combines nostalgia for the outgoing century, uncertainty and even some fear about new and unknown, and invariably hopes for a better life.

And still, there is a great difference between people of the end of last century and the end of this century. The main difference is that we realize that the stronger the hope, the more powerful and combined the efforts need to be in order to translate it into a reality.

I suggest making the 1990's a decade of the drawing of the United States and the Soviet Union closer together on the basis of universal human values and the balance of interests, and, together with all countries, ridding the world of fears and mistrust, of superfluous and unnecessary weapons, of outdated political concepts and military doctrines, and of artificial barriers between people and states. 1990 could become a genuine turning point in the efforts to limit and reduce arms. We, on our part, shall do everything for that.

At the same time our two countries could do much for further improvement of the overall moral and political climate in the world. In this case one may have no doubt that we shall bring nearer the transformation of the world and will make it calmer and more reasonable.

The 1990's can become a decade when freedom, democracy, and equality will begin to be established on a global scale and in an increasingly irreversible way.

People may say that all these are long-known truths and age-old values. Indeed, this is so. But never before were we prepared so well for implementing them as now, at the turn of the 20th Century. Let us work purposefully, patiently and with belief in their triumph.

I want to wish good health and every success to all citizens of the United States. I wish your children and grandchildren, those who have them, to become happy dwellers of the 21st Century which will, of course, be better than ours if we combine our efforts for the sake of that.

I cordially wish all Americans a Happy New Year.

Bessmertnykh Summons U.S. Envoy About Panama

LD3012132289 Moscow TASS in English 1313 GMT 30 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 30 TASS—Soviet First Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh on Saturday summoned U.S. Ambassador to the USSR Jack Matlock.

He set out the Soviet view of the situation in Panama that has obtained as a result of U.S. intervention and the action undertaken by the U.S. occupation force against diplomatic missions of several countries in violation of the existing norms of international law.

It was reaffirmed that the interests of normalising and stabilising the situation in the Central American region call for the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Panama.

Panama Shows 'Bush Doctrine' in Operation

PM0101144590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent A. Shalnev "Viewpoint": "Bush Doctrine?"]

[Text] New York—The President uttered just three words. "Let's do it," he said, rounding off the conference with his closest aides, who had assembled that Sunday at midday in George Bush's office on the second floor of the White House.

The decision to invade Panama had been made.

Ironically, the conference had taken place in an office one of whose walls was adorned with a picture entitled "The Peacemakers," showing a meeting between President Lincoln and a group of his generals at the height of the Civil War between the North and the South. In a sense the term "conference" was a formal one: According to information currently finding its way into the press, President Bush did not confer with his advisers and did not make any effort at all to ensure that everyone at the midday meeting was of the same opinion. Bush had already effectively made the decision for himself. At the conference he sought to obtain as much detailed information as possible, which finally convinced him that an invasion would achieve the necessary goals with minimum losses and at minimum cost. Sated with informnation, as NEWSWEEK put it, he said: "Let's do it."

It was a little more than 48 hours before the start of "just cause," the biggest U.S. military action abroad since Vietnam.

A detailed analysis of this operation and its military, political, economic, social, and financial consequences—both for Panama and the United States, and for many other countries, primarily Latin America—has yet to be made. But some things are obvious. Above all: The Panama action, as TIME magazine writes, marked yet another stage in the process of the "monumental transformation of George Bush—from a man who in the first months of his presidency did his utmost to avoid doing anything stupid, into a self-confident leader, devising a bold, although not always thorough, foreign policy and perfectly prepared to back his foreign policy with military force."

What is the explanation for Bush's metamorphosis? There are several factors. First, the vigorously demonstrated readiness for actions which are not only bold but sometimes highly risky and which in every instance have met with criticism—in varying amounts, of course. To a varying degree it is, I suppose, a reaction to the very heavy accusations of passivity and excessive caution made against Bush in the initial months of his government. Bush's character is such—and many of the people who know him well say this—that when he feels his back is against the wall, the President can act very abruptly. Talking specifically about Panama, the intensive campaign of attacks on the President, which was launched

after the unsuccessful coup on 3 October, had a very significant part to play in Bush's decision to invade. The administration as a whole and Bush above all were accused of being unable to correctly evaluate and react accurately to the situation taking shape in Panama and of being unwilling to back the forces opposing Noriega, who, through Washington's propaganda efforts, had been turned into the United States' "personal enemy" and who, as Bush himself had made it perfectly clear on several occasions, had to be removed from power. But when the opportunity arose to turn words into actions and, by supporting the plotters, remove Noriega, nothing was done, as those who criticized Bush emphasized.

Bush reacts very badly to criticism anyway, in particular to attacks relating to his competence in the foreign policy and national security sphere, that is, in the sphere where his experience is vast, experience acquired during his work as director of the CIA, U.S. permanent representative at the United Nations, and head of the liaison mission in Beijing. The wave of discontent that rose in U.S. political circles following the failure of the attempted coup in Panama was, in all likelihood, the drop that caused Bush's rather shallow cup of patience to overflow. He assumed that the discontent was entirely due to him. There was another psychological factor involved here. Bush, to cite THE NEW YORK TIMES, was simply obsessed with Noriega. The Panamanian leader was the same for Bush as Ayatollah Khomeyni had been for Jimmy Carter and Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi for Ronald Reagan. The President could not bear to see the leader of a tiny country constantly upstage him, the President of a superpower. Whatever the United States did and whatever political and economic pressure it brought to bear in its efforts to remove the Panamanian general from power, the results were negligible. Even direct approaches to Noriega, carried out in the strictest secrecy and in clear contradiction of the public pledge Bush himself made "not to deal with drug dealers"—approaches proposing a kind of "amicable agreement" whereby Noriega would relinquish power and leave Panama, and the United States would leave him in peace—ended in humiliation for Washington and for Bush personally: Noriega replied: "No, no deals." Maybe it was his fatal mistake.

Second, the President's foreign policy audacity is not only a reaction to the changing situation in the world, but also—more important—a consequence of these changes. In my view, the administration tends to view the events in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe as confirming the supremacy and preeminence of the United States in the world. It is worth mentioning a phrase which, according to THE WASHINGTON POST, General Colin Powell, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, used in a private conversation with his colleagues: I think, he said, we should hang a sign on the doors of the United States: "Here lives a superpower." The meaning is clear, it seems to me: There is only one great power in the world now: the United States. Because it is alone, its obligations are particularly great, but great also are its rights, essential to the discharge of these obligations, very important among which is the preservation and maintenance of democracy all over the world.

Here is a characteristic detail: Operation "just cause"—incidentally, the name was suggested by Defense Secretary Richard Cheney—was the first major military action the United States had taken on a unilateral basis for many years. The invasion of Grenada had been carried out in 1983 in cooperation—even if it was purely formal—with a number of Caribbean countries; the bombing of Libya, carried out in 1986, was also partly a joint affair—Britain was involved. In Panama, the United States chose to act by itself, without attempting even to create a semblance of "collective effort." This, it appears to me, is a sign of Washington's growing conviction of its special destiny, of the United States' special role in current world processes, the role of "sole" superpower.

Another characteristic detail: The invasion of Panama was essentially the first major military action since World War II not associated—directly or indirectly, as was the case, let us suppose, in Libya in 1986—with the task of "containing communism." The link was not present either in the recent interference in the Philippines, when U.S. military aircraft demonstrated military support for the government of Corazon Aquino during the latest abortive coup d'etat. Are we not seeing, TIME magazine asks, a "new foreign policy taking shape in the United States, the policy of the post-cold-war period, in which Washington is assuming a qualitatively different role of world gendarme, acting more to save democracy than to contain Soviet expansionism"? "Administration officials," the magazine continues, "categorically deny, however, that it is an attempt to proclaim a Bush doctrine."

It is not the name that matters, of course, although it is possible that in time it will be established in politics. Reagan's White House never admitted the existence of a Reagan doctrine, which never prevented him from implementing this doctrine, giving assistance to those whom Washington called freedom-fighters—be they the Nicaraguan Contras or the Afghan mujahidin. We denied the existence of the Brezhnev doctrine, but it was zealously implemented, beginning with Czechoslovakia and ending with Afghanistan. I repeat, it is not the name that matters, but the sum total of actions that are already being taken or are yet to be taken, and which are channeled in a rather specific strategic direction with a rather precise ultimate goal.

One of the strategic goals of Bush's White House is the total "democratization" of the Western hemisphere. There is not much left to do, in fact, in order to attain this goal: Following the overthrow of Noriega only two countries—Cuba and Nicaragua—feature on Washington's list of countries with "nondemocratic" regimes. It may well be that the invasion of Panama was conceived, among other things, as a warning to Havana, and, in particular, to the Sandinistas, who, in February, have to

fight the opposition at the ballot box and to whom Washington has made it plain: "Do not think of repeating what Noriega did when he annulled the May elections, which were won by his opponents."

I would not venture to suggest that plans similar to those currently being carried out in Panama are being devised for Nicaragua, let alone for Cuba—this would require precise information, not conjecture. But I have the impression that after Panama Washington will be prepared to establish itself more firmly in the role of world gendarme—savior of democracy. And not necessarily in Latin America alone. Objectively, this could be aided by the fact that operation "just cause" did not encounter any particularly significant opposition on the part of world public opinion or on the part of political circles. For example, the OAS, having sat for 2 days, adopted a resolution merely expressing regret but in no way condemning the invasion of Panama. It is true that Peru recalled its ambassador from Washington, but I do not think the U.S. Administration even noticed.

The main thing is that the action against Panama met with resolute support on the part of the vast majority of Americans, who were trained long ago by propaganda to hate Noriega and who saw the invasion as an act of justice. It was the same, I recall, with the bombing of Libya: At the time, Al-Qadhdhafi was regarded as the U.S. number one enemy, and the attempt to physically destroy him was seen by the vast majority of inhabitants of the United States as natural and perfectly justified.

The support on Capitol Hill was impressive too: There were practically no protests. However, the top leaders of Congress had learned of the invasion only 3 hours before it began. In the case of the assault on Grenada, congressmen were given much more time to think.

There is yet another fact that falls into the same category: The decision to invade was such a private matter that at most a dozen people knew about it. "Many of the government officials who now have to deal with the economic, political, and diplomatic problems created by operation 'just cause'," THE WASHINGTON POST writes, "had no inkling of the decision. The President insisted on absolute secrecy. The first meeting of administration officials, called to decide how to deal with the problems, the problems of creating a government in Panama and resurrecting the economy, was not held until Wednesday, after the invasion troops had landed in Panama."

It seems to me that these factors—the restrained reaction abroad and extensive support at home, combined with the absence of any significant protests about the secrecy surrounding the Panama decisionmaking process—could, in fact, confirm the administration's notion that it is entirely suited to the functions of a "democratic gendarme." Even if these functions are not clothed in a doctrine with a specific name.

Interrupting its Christmas and New Year vacation, the UN General Assembly met Thursday to discuss the situation in and around Panama. The agenda was a draft resolution jointly presented by Cuba and Nicaragua, expressing "profound regret" in connection with the U.S. armed invasion of Panama.

A similar resolution was discussed at the end of last week at the Security Council, but a triple veto by the United States, Britain, and France prevented it from being adopted.

In fact, no debate occurred at the General Assembly on Thursday: Because of the lack of time and by virtue of various procedural problems, only one delegate was able to speak: the Nicaraguan representative. What was significant about his speech was above all facts. The following, for example: The United States has now invaded countries south of the Rio Grande on 46 occasions; the present invasion of Panama is the sixth; a whole series of international agreements and accords, including several articles of the UN Charter and OAS charter, have been violated by invasions. The U.S. actions, the Nicaraguan delegate reminded the meeting, also contravene a number of resolutions adopted by the UN General Assembly.

I believe that Washington will also be prepared, through its actions, to ignore yet another resolution—one that is currently under discussion and will, in all likelihood, be adopted by the General Assembly Friday. It can be said in advance that the United States and some of its allies will vote against it, despite the fact that in principle the draft prposed by Cuba and Nicaragua is relatively restrained. I will remind you that it is not a condemnation of the U.S. military action against Panama, but only an expression of profound regret.

The other points in the resolution, which, in any case, will not be binding, are as follows: The United States must stop its intervention and immediately withdraw its troops from Panama—that is, the troops who were brought in specially for the invasion, not those which are in Panama permanently to "safeguard the defense of the Panama Canal"; Washington must strictly adhere to the spirit and letter of the treaties on the Panama Canal; and all states must respect Panama's sovereignty, independence, and territorial integrity.

USSR-U.S. Communication Channel Tested

LD2912210289 Moscow TASS in English 2049 GMT 29 Dec 89

[Text] Sevastopol December 29 TASS—Soviet and American military men held a joint test of communication air-to-air, air-to-ground and air-to-ship channels, making a step in implementation of the intergovernmental Soviet-American agreement on preventing dangerous military activity which will come into force on January 1, 1990.

The important action involved Black Sea men, chief of staff of the Red Banner Black Sea fleet Vice Admiral Valentin Selivanov told TASS. The Soviet escort ship

Razitelny interacted with a U.S. frigate and a war plane. Communication men of both sides displayed efficiency. The first joint exercise was a success.

U.S. 'Titan-3' Rocket Launch Postponed

LD3012121589 Moscow TASS in English 1205 GMT 30 Dec 89

[Text] New York December 30 TASS—Strong air currents in the upper layers of the atmosphere keep the U.S. Titan-3 space rocket grounded. Its launch was postponed on Friday for the eighth time over the past three weeks owing to unfavourable weather conditions.

The United States attaches special importance to the forthcoming launch from the cosmodrome on Cape Canaveral, Florida.

During its first flight, this commercial booster rocket, the most powerful one in the United States as of today, is to deliver to orbit two communications satellites, one of which will be used by British Armed Forces and the other by Japanese corporations.

The mission will practically mark the beginning of a new trend in the American space research strategy.

By a decision taken by the U.S. Administration after the space shuttle Challenger disaster in 1986, the orbiting of all commercial payloads is to be entrusted to private-owned companies.

China

Normalization of Ties With PRC Lauded

PM2912115389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Dec 89 Second Edition p6

[V. Ovchinnikov "Retrospective-89": "Affecting One-Quarter of Mankind"]

[Text] If the significance of any event were determined by the number of people directly affected by it, the list of important dates in 1989 should begin with the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations as a result of the May meeting between the two countries' leaders in Beijing.

Relations between the two largest states in the world, whose population accounts for one-quarter of all mankind, are restored to normal. The wall of alienation which, for almost 3 decades, divided these neighboring socialist countries, the birthplaces of the two great revolutions of the 20th century, has been torn down. The conditions for normal contacts between our peoples have been restored, and, what is more, just when these contacts have become a vital necessity. After all, for all the differences in the specific conditions, perestroyka in the Soviet Union and the reforms in China have similar aims and are encountering similar difficulties. Perhaps we now need each other more than ever before and need to exchange experiences of renewing socialism: both positive and negative experiences. Learning lessons from our neighbor's failures is now just as valuable as adopting everything instructive from his successes. So it is particularly gratifying that the year of the PRC's 40th anniversary was also the year of the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations.

Henceforth, the universally recognized principles of interstate contacts are the basis for these relations: mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, nonaggression, noninterference in internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence. We have always stood up for these five principles in relations between states with different social systems. The new political thinking gives a broader interpretation to peaceful coexistence. Today, following its principles means not only living in peace but also actively cooperating, deepening interdependence, and progressing toward a really stable, long-term balance of interests.

The paramount task since the normalization of relations has been to create a base of constructive cooperation facilitating perestroyka in the Soviet Union and the reforms in China, and make the transition to new forms of trade and economic and scientific and technical ties. In view of the fact that the world focus of business activity is shifting ever more perceptibly toward the Pacific basin, to all appearances, Europe's interest in Asia will grow in the nineties and there will be increasing economic collaboration between them. Against this background, Soviet-Chinese cooperation could gain a new global role. The prospect of becoming the buttresses of the bridge between Europe and Asia and between the Atlantic and the Pacific is opening up before our countries.

The beneficial effects of the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations will be felt in various spheres. But one of them became evident immediately: Each of the neighboring peoples felt that their rear was safe and secure. Even when progress toward normalization had only just begun, they were able to lower the level of military confrontation. China reduced the numerical strength of its Army by 1 million. The Soviet Union's decision to unilaterally cut its Armed Forces by half a million affects 200,000 servicemen in the Asian part of the country of which, 120,000 of them are in the Far East. Three-quarters of the Soviet troops in Mongolia will return home by the end of next year. Moscow has expressed willingness to work for the complete demilitarization of the Soviet-Chinese border in the future and only keep personnel there that are necessary for routine border service.

Turning the Soviet-Chinese border into a region of peace and good-neighborliness stretching for 7,500 km not only makes it possible for the two peoples to free up considerable resources for constructive purposes. By normalizing relations, the Soviet Union and China have refuted conjectures that prolonged enmity between them is inevitable, removed a hotbed of tension in Asia that

has caused understandable concern among other peoples, and created the preconditions for military detente in the Asian and Pacific region.

The normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations reflects the general trend of positive changes in Asia and, at the same time, contributes to these changes. Our two states work on the basis that peace and development are the main problems of the age. The concept of a new international political order put forward by Beijing is, in many respects, consonant with our ideas on new political thinking. By speaking out in favor of eliminating mass destruction weapons and against the militarization of space, condemning foreign presence in the territories of others, and supporting the creation of nuclear-free zones, the PRC brings a positive impact to bear on the world climate.

The Soviet and Chinese approaches to the key problems of the age are very close or coincide. However, in my view, there is still untapped potential for these two neighboring socialist states to take parallel measures in the international arena. By coordinating their efforts, they could do considerably more to roll back the threat of nuclear and ecological catastrophe and help to find fair solutions to regional conflicts. The normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations as a result of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Beijing in 1989 is only just beginning to reveal the potential for collaboration between our states for the good of mankind.

Jiang Zemin on Combating 'Bourgeois Liberalization'

PM0101150990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Dec 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Jiang Zemin Speech"]

[Text] Beijing, 29 Dec—Our party and state are going through an extremely critical period. We must preserve the stability of the political situation in the country and firmly and steadfastly promote the cause of socialist modernization, CPC Central Committee General Secretary Jiang Zemin said today at a meeting with students studying theoretical questions of party building, a XINHUA agency report says. The struggle against bourgeois liberalization is a long-term one and this must not be underestimated.

The CPC Central Committee general secretary noted that the intensification of party building means arming the party with Marxism-Leninism and the ideas of Mao Zedong. It is necessary firmly and steadfastly to continue reforming the political system, but the reform must be conducive to strengthening the party leadership and not to abolishing or weakening the party, he stressed.

Youth Paper Recalls Tiananmen Events

PM0201103190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 31 Dec 89 p 2

[Own correspondent A. Platkovskiy dispatch: "China: People Against Tanks"]

[Text] Beijing-Pyongyang—"I was at home that Saturday evening. I was sitting over there, typing," Patrick Leskot [surname as transliterated], correspondent for AFP's Beijing bureau, indicated a table by the window piled high with papers. "Things were calm in the street. I could not even imagine then that such a thing would happen."

Patrick was speaking of the days when China experienced a terrible upheaval.

"I ran out onto the balcony," Patrick recalled with emotion, "when shots rang out. I at once threw myself to the floor, but I had time to notice that they were firing directly at people in the street."

I heard similar stories from many journalists and diplomats when I visited Beijing in the fall. By then the traces of caterpillar tracks could no longer be made out on the roads, and the people of Beijing avoided conversations with foreigners on this topic.

At 1300 on Sunday 4 June a voice was heard on the wavelength of Radio Beijing's English service: "Remember 4 June 1989," the announcer appealed. "A tragic event has happened in the Chinese capital. Thousands of people, mainly peaceful citizens, have been shot by soldiers of the Chinese People's Army..." This was the only occasion when information at variance with official reports found its way onto the air.

Government propaganda and the Main Political Directorate of the Chinese Army did not accept that version of the Beijing events. Exposing "rumors and fabrications," they quickly and promptly disseminated materials with "the truth about events in Beijing." They were addressed not only to the outside world but to Beijing students, workers, and employees and to millions of Chinese.

Analyzing the Beijing events, Deng Xiaoping said: "These upheavals had to happen sooner or later, they were occasioned by international and internal factors, were inevitable, and did not depend on anyone's will." It is possible to agree partly with that assessment. We can see that, as the reforms grow deeper in socialist countries, society is entering a period of political struggle between those who seek to preserve the structures of centralized power and those who uphold the aims of the system's democratization. Only the methods of this struggle are different. How can one fail to recall the sacramental phrase of the "great helmsman"—"Power grows from the barrel of a gun!" We know where this principle has led the country. Does the one with strength on his side always win?

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Rogachev Discusses Cambodian Problem After Visit

BK3112105289 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 30 Dec 89

[Report on an interview with Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev upon his return from a tour of

the Indochinese countries, by an unidentified Moscow Radio "commentator," time and place not given—read by announcers]

[Text] Our commentator has interviewed Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Comrade Igor Rogachev who recently returned from visits to a number of Asian countries. During his visits, Comrade Rogachev discussed the Cambodian problem with leaders of Cambodia, Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand. Here is the interview on this issue.

[Question] After Vietnam withdrew all its troops from Cambodia in September 1989, the opposition forces launched vigorous military operations against the Phnom Penh troops which resulted in a situation which many mass propaganda media, including in (?Asia), described as an impasse. What do you say?

[Answer] A civil war broke out in western Cambodia. This is a dangerous tendency which could lead to consequences no one can predict.

Comrade Igor Rogachev continued: I would like to note that lately, when the Cambodian situation deteriorated, a number of concerned countries put forward attractive proposals aimed at normalizing the situation. In my view, talking about an impasse is not proper. I would like to recall the constructive proposal of Thai Prime Minister Chatchai Chunhawan calling for a new round of unofficial talks among the Cambodian parties in the near future with the participation of Vietnam, Laos, the ASEAN states, and France in its role as co-chairman of the Paris conference on Cambodia. The Soviet Union has proposed ending weapon supplies to all Cambodian parties for a period. We have discussed this proposal with the United States and a number of other countries. This proposal has received international support. Australian Foreign Minister Evans put forward an interesting initiative. He proposed the establishment of a UN administration in Cambodia which will be in control until a new government can be set up through general elections in the country.

[Question] As far as I know, Mr Evans' proposal attracted Phnom Penh's attention. Did you discuss this with Cambodian leaders?

[Answer] I discussed Mr Evans' proposal with Comrade Hun Sen, head of the Cambodian Government. Comrade Hun Sen said the Cambodian Government is ready to discuss this proposal. However, Phnom Penh put forward its own proposal. The Cambodian leader in Phnom Penh said Cambodia's seat in the United Nations should be left vacant. I would like to point out that Phnom Penh is very worried of the possibility of the Khmer Rouge—who are guilty of genocidal policies in Cambodia in the second half of the 1970's—returning to the country. The State of Cambodia's government noted with happy sentiments that the Australian prime minister absolutely opposed this return.

Additionally, Phnom Penh's attitude is flexible. In Phnom Penh people are of the opinion that the two sides—the Phnom Penh Government and the so-called Government of Democratic Kampuchea led by Samdech Sihanouk—should hold talks on normalizing the situation. Everyone knows that the opposing groups [words indistinct] into this government. The State of Cambodia's government has agreed to this kind of negotiations. And we think that this attitude is reasonable.

[Question] Please comment on the Soviet Union's general attitude toward the Cambodian issue.

[Answer] Our attitude is this: In any situation, negotiations should not be interrupted. We are in favor of continuing negotiations among Cambodian parties, at the regional level, and at the international level within the framework of the Paris conference on Cambodia. It ought to be said that in the near future, probably in the spring of 1990, there would be favorable conditions for the Paris conference to resume its work.

Cambodian Leaders Interviewed on Situation

Deputy Defense Minister

PM0101180990 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 28 Dec 89 p3

[Interview with General Ke Kimyan [name as transliterated], Cambodian deputy defense minister, by own correspondent A. Romashko in Phnom Penh, under the heading "Who's Who in Cambodia"; date unspecified]

[Text] [Romashko] How would you describe the present military-political situation in Cambodia?

[Ke Kimyan] Briefly, the situation is still complex and explosive. The Vietnamese troops have left but the conflict is continuing. In the past the Khmer reactionaries justified their actions by saying that they were fighting the Vietnamese, who had allegedly "occupied" Cambodia. But now there is not a single Vietnamese soldier in the country and the opposition's military operations are becoming increasingly active.

[Romashko] Has this come as a surprise to you?

[Ke Kimyan] Of course not. We were prepared for the enemies of our government trying to exploit the withdrawal of the Vietnamese troops to gain at least temporary military victories. With the population's support, in spring and summer this year army units conducted several successful operations, eliminated one of the main Pol Pot bases on our country's territory, and discovered a considerable number of secret arms and ammunitions depots. Following a government appeal, thousands of rebels have returned to their families and peaceful life. According to our statistics, the numerical strength of the opposition's armed formations has been reduced by almost two-thirds this year.

[Romashko] So, what kind of forces does it now have at its disposal?

[Ke Kimyan] Our most serious enemies are Pol Pot's men. There are about 30,000 of them. Of these, almost 18,000 are soldiers. Then there are the supporters of Prince Sihanouk, who was once Cambodian prime minister and later became head of the government in exile of so-called "Democratic Kampuchea." He has managed to gather 7,000-8,000 people under his banners. The third grouping represents the interests of the former pro-American regime of General Lon Nol. This is now led by Son Sann, also a prominent political figure in this administration. It is true, however, that there are only 2,000-3,000 fighters in his "armed forces."

[Romashko] The Son Sann grouping has traditionally been considered the most "harmless" of the opposition groups. It has conducted almost no active military operations and, moreover, has always been kept down and sometimes simply robbed by its stronger rivals, primarily the "Khmer Rouge." What is the explanation for its unexpected aggression literally in the first days after the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia?

[Ke Kimyan] Hun Sen's government is not to the liking of many countries in the West, and in our region too. But in the last 10 years it has proved its viability and enjoys broad support among the people. It is not very likely that it will be totally removed from power by peaceful means, as a result of free general elections. That is why the enemies of the regime have resolved to make use of the Vietnamese troop withdrawal and conduct "reconnaissance in force." There is no point in the Pol Pot grouping trying to get anywhere. Most Cambodians see them as their hangmen, and perhaps only Beijing would venture to openly bank on the "Khmer Rouge."

[Romashko] So they have decided to make the Son Sann group their "trial balloon"?

[Ke Kimyan] Right. Members of this group have been "trained" by experienced instructors, provided with the very latest weapons, and moved across the border. And then the Sihanouk and Pol Pot groups have gone in after them.

[Romashko] Every opposition grouping has its own wealthy patron. Who are they?

[Ke Kimyan] The so-called "noncommunist" formations, that is, the Sihanouk and Son Sann factions, enjoy the patronage of Western countries, while the Pol Pot group is mainly supported by China.

[Romashko] What form does this support take?

[Ke Kimyan] I would highlight three main aspects. The first: supplies of weapons, ammunition, and military hardware. The second: "humanitarian" aid. It is called this because it is originally intended for Khmer refugees. The change of regimes and also the many years of civil war have forced many of our compatriots to leave their country. However, the lion's share of this aid—mainly food, clothing, and other essential goods—ultimately falls into the hands of Pol Pot's followers. To be perfectly frank, they simply rob their "junior" partners in the opposition, for whom aid from Western countries and international organizations is mainly intended. Not without reason, Prince Sihanouk complained to the United Nations of the bandit-like actions of the "Khmer Rouge," who went on a rampage of slaughter in one of the camps of his supporters. And, finally, the third aspect: political support for the opposition in the international arena. This cannot be underestimated, if only because the Pol Pot group has managed to retain Cambodia's seat in the United Nations to this day, thanks to the endeavors of Western countries, China, and some states in the Asian and Pacific region.

[Romashko] I have heard that aid for the Khmer opposition is no longer confined only to supplies of weapons, ammunition, food, and "political asylum."

[Ke Kimyan] According to our information—and this is confirmed by Western sources—China, the United States, Thailand, France, Britain, Singapore, and Malaysia are all directly involved in the reactionaries' military operations. Their "roles" are divided up as follows. China, the United States, France, and Singapore are "responsible" for military supplies. Thailand, Britain, Malaysia, and the United States are directly involved in the military training of the Sihanouk and Son Sann armed formations, while China takes care of the Pol Pot group's military training.

We also have information that Chinese, American, and Thai military advisers and mercenaries from Thailand were involved alongside the Khmer reactionaries' armed detachments in recent attacks on the border district centers of Sisophon, Thma Pok, and Pailin.

The international forces with an interest in the removal of our government have no wish to terminate military aid to the Khmer opposition. They know that, without military aid, there will be no civil war and that then there will only be one way left to resolve the Cambodian problem: national reconciliation and honest cooperation between all political groupings for the sake of a future independent, free, neutral, nonaligned Cambodia.

[Romashko] All political groupings with the exception of the Pol Pot group?

[Ke Kimyan] The Pol Pot group, or, as they prefer to call themselves, the "Khmer Rouge," wiped out almost half of the nation during their time in power. This cannot be denied even by their most ardent defenders. Even after their expulsion and 11 years of partisan struggle against their own people, they have not changed either their essence or their views.

[Romashko] Recently, all three opposition groupings have claimed that they have gained serious military victories and seized a considerable amount of territory along the Cambodia-Thailand border. What can you say in this connection?

[Ke Kimyan] The situation on the western border is indeed serious but not hopeless, as the opposition and some Western journalists are trying to make out.

The first military conflict took place on 30 September, that is, just several days after the Vietnamese troops withdrew. At that stage the opposition intended to seize the three northwestern provinces and set up a bridgehead there for launching an offensive on the center of the country.

They have indeed succeeded in occupying several remote, sparsely populated districts, but most of the territory of the border provinces is still under the control of government forces.

[Romashko] Despite the fact that they are "sparsely populated," the districts and population centers seized by antigovernment forces evidently have strategic significance.

[Ke Kimyan] In principle they offer favorable opportunities to a certain extent for developing the offensive on larger cities and provincial centers. But I would like to point out that our enemies have not just chosen the direction of their attacks purely for military interests. For example, the Pol Pot group is trying to hold onto the Pailin district, where there are promising ruby deposits.

[Romashko] However, the main aim of Pol Pot's followers and their "allies" is still Phnom Penh.

[Ke Kimyan] Yes, the ultimate program is to seize power in the country. But this task is beyond them.

[Romashko] Nevertheless, the civil war in Cambodia is flaring up with renewed force. Where does the solution lie?

[Ke Kimyan] By their actions the opposition has forced us to take up arms, although we are convinced that war is the worst possible option for resolving the Cambodian problem. It is precisely for this reason that our government is in favor of continuing a peaceful dialogue with the opposition and supports those initiatives which really aim to find a political solution to the conflict.

Hun Sen

LD0201093990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 2 Jan 90

[Text] The start of a new year is always a time for summing up results and trying to glimpse the future. The 80's were not easy for the State of Cambodia. What awaits it in the future? What do the state's present leaders think about the past? Our correspondent in Phnom Penh, Yevgeniy Kochanov, has interviewed Hun Sen, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the State of Cambodia.

[Begin recording] [Kochanov] Comrade Hun Sen, the situation in Cambodia is of great interest to many people in the Soviet Union. How would you describe the contemporary military and political scene in your country?

[Hun Sen in Cambodian with superimposed Russian translation] After we failed to reach an agreement at the Paris conference it became clear that it was impossible to avoid civil war in Cambodia. The withdrawal of Vietnamese troops, which was effected in spite of the lack of an agreement on a cease-fire or an end to foreign military aid to the armed Khmer opposition, altered the balance of forces within the country. Aware of this, the adversary determined to try his strength on the battlefield for 6 months or a year before coming to the negotiating table again. At the same time, China, the United States and a number of other countries made significant increases in aid to the Khmer opposition so as to further an offensive against us.

After the withdrawal of Vietnam's troops, the forces of the tripartite coalition, in which the Khmer Rouge plays the main role, launched a large-scale offensive in a number of areas on the Cambodia-Thailand frontier, using all its forces and potential. Geographical conditions in these areas favor the penetration of the advisery's forces, equipping them with weapons and ammunition and organizing their combat activities [as heard]. The adversary has attempted to exploit the situation to deal a blow to the positions left by the Vietnamese troops and has taken advantage of weather conditions in the rainy season. Three months of action in the field have enabled us to see and assess the adversary's actual forces and opportunities. It is clear that a real civil war is underway in the country, unleashed by the Khmer Rouge and their allies, with the aim of restoring the Pol Pot regime in Cambodia. This cruel war is causing suffering to the people of Cambodia. It is, however, to the advantage of the Pol Pot supporters and their allies who are endeavoring to seize power by military means and attempting by all possible means to impede a political settlement tdo the Cambodian problem. The supporters of Pol Pot, Sihanouk, and Son Sann have practically nothing to distinguish them one from the other. Wherever they appear, people die, bridges, schools, hospitals, even temples are destroyed. The present situation could change since the war is continuing. In general the military situation remains tense whilst political settlement has reached a dead end. [end recording]

Near East & South Asia

Libya Issues Denial About Mercenaries in Romania

PM2912162589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 7

[Item from "International Departments' Mailbag" column: "Concerning Reports From Romania"]

[Text] Moscow—The Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah People's Bureau in Moscow expresses its respect for the IZVESTIYA editorial board and has the

honor to announce that the item "Romania After the Execution of Ceausescu," published in your newspaper under the rubric "Panorama of International Events" (IZVESTIYA No 361), contains the following paragraph: "Citing information from the Romanian city of Arad, the DPA agency broadcast the news of the "capture of five Libyan mercenaries," who had participated in the bombardment of a hospital in the city. Humgarian Foreign Minister G. Horn, speaking on Hungarian radio, said that the new Romanian leadership "has proof of the presence of Arab mercenaries in the country."

This "news" compels the People's Bureau to ask you to publish the attached statement by the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah People's Bureau in Moscow in connection with this reference.

The Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah People's Bureau in Moscow takes this opportunity to reiterate its assurances of high esteem.

STATEMENT:

Some official circles and media hostile to the Great Jamahiriyah have spread fabricated rumors about Libyans participating in the events currently taking place in Romania.

Categorically rejecting these fabrications, the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah in Moscow [as published] reaffirms the Jamahiriyah's position, based on belief in the peoples' right and ability to seize power from traditional totalitarian and party regimes.

The rumors spread by official circles for overtly provocative reasons have nothing to do with the Jamahiriyah—a state of the masses, in which the people possess the power, the wealth, and the weapons.

[Signed] Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah People's Bureau.

Special Envoy on Release of Soviet POWs

LD2712211389 Moscow TASS in English 1818 GMT 27 Dec

[Excerpts] Moscow December 27 TASS—By TASS correspondent Igor Agabekov:

The ringing of bells called Muscovites today to attend a divine service in commemoration of Soviet servicemen missed in Afghanistan. The service was held in temples in Moscow and other cities to mark the 10th anniversary of Soviet troops' entry into that country. [passage omitted]

"The Soviet Embassy in Pakistan has, for more than a year maintained contacts with the government of that country and, through it, with representatives of the Afghan armed opposition to achieve the release of Soviet prisoners of war," Soviet Foreign Ministry ambassador for special missions Nikolay Kozyrev told TASS.

"This work is going on at present. Public figures and representatives of international organisations are involved in this work. [no closing quotation mark as received]

The Soviet diplomat described the recent release of two Soviet soldiers from captivity as "a good will gesture." He said an analogous gesture was being prepared by the Afghan side—eight mujahidins and 25 Pakistanis would soon be handed over to the Pakistani side in Kabul.

"We hope this will set the beginning to a process that will progress," Kozyrev said, "but much will depend on the political settlement in Afghanistan."

Afghanistan's La'eq on 'Political Pluralism'

LD0101173890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 1 Jan 90

[Interview with Sulayman La'eq, Afghanistan Politburo member and secretary of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, by A. Shkirando, from the "Vremya" newscast; date, place not given—live or recorded]

[Excerpt] Today is the 25th anniversary of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan [PDPA]. [passage omitted]

[Shkirando] What specific steps is the party taking to normalize the situation in the country?

[La'eq in Dari with superimposed Russian] We link the end of the war and the establishment of peace with the humane policy of national reconciliation initiated by the PDPA. Unfortunately, many years passed before its implementation. I shall not conceal that we used to believe that our party alone was capable of ensuring progressive development in Afghanistan, but the numerous problems related to the country's backwardness and foreign interference convinced us that we would not succeed in resolving the very complex issues, and above all, achieve the establishment of a durable peace in isolation. That is why we have undertaken political pluralism, which means that at present, the PDPA is not the only ruling party, but acts jointly with seven other parties and political organizations.

Commentary Views Iranian Reaction to Panama Attack

NC2712170389 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 26 Dec 89

[Unattributed commentary]

[Excerpt] Along with the people of the Soviet Union and the social circles of other countries, the Iranians have protested with anger and loathing at the U.S. armed aggression against Panamanian territory. In this action, they see a retrogression to the inhuman policy of resorting to force and trampling international rights and norms underfoot.

Meanwhile, the Iranian media are endeavoring to capitalize on Panamanian events for purposes of undermining the positive trends which are in conformity with

and endorse the new political thinking in the world. For example, the IRNA commentator, while reviewing the Panama catastrophe, sees it as a so-called outcome of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Malta.

The fact that the U.S. aggression against a small Latin American country harms the positive international trend cannot be disputed. Unfortunately, even today, attempts to seek solutions to international issues by resorting to force, government-sponsored terrorist acts, and gunboat diplomacy, which were a hallmark of the cold war era of the past, exist alongside the positive trends.

It appears that the obligation of all peaceloving forces in the world would be to strive to assist the new trend of political thought and to eliminate the outmoded concept of confrontation, cliches, and (?obsolete thinking). The Iranian media's efforts in attributing the events in Panama to the Soviet-U.S. leaders' meeting does not contribute to the new trend, especially since there is no reason to draw such a conclusion.

The fact is that the Malta talks and the aggression and attack against Panama fall into (?separate) categories. The purpose of the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush was to improve Soviet-U.S. bilateral relations, dismantle the impediments to removing the mistrust prevailing in the world, and, in general, to improvee the international political climate.

However, the Pentagon's actions in Panama were the result of the influence of certain forces who are also opposed to all the above trends. These actions are merely a continuation of the (?earlier) U.S. actions in Indochina, in the Persian Gulf region, and, ultimately, in Latin America. The Soviet Union rejects such a policy. The USSR's stance at the Malta meeting was diametrically opposed to anything that might generate misunderstandings about collusion against developing countries. Did the Iranian publications not state that the participants in the Malta summit had differences of opinion regarding their assessments of the situation in Central America, on the issue of the reduction of military-naval forces in the Mediterranean, and so on? Why does IRNA now claim that the events can only be understood in the context of the desire by the great powers to divide the world once again as they did at the Yalta conference in 1945?

This has been commented upon earlier and once again it is being repeated that any effort on the part of Iranian publications to seek an analogy between the Malta summit and the [words indistinct] Yalta conference is a mistake. It is too farfetched to term the Yalta conference as collusion by the great powers on the division of the world, including its Islamic regions, into their respective spheres of influence. [passage omitted].

Amal-Hizballah Clashes in Lebanon Examined

NC2812193089 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 28 Dec 89

[Text] In the past few days, fighting between the Amal and Hizballah Shiite groupings has intensified in southern Lebanon. We are going to speak about these disastrous incidents with our commentator Yuriy Andreyev. Could you please tell us about what has happened recently in southern Lebanon?

[Andreyev] Last Saturday, in the region of Iqlim al-Tuffah to the east of Sidon, armed clashes took place between the Amal Movement and the Hizballah faction. On that day, early in the morning, the Hizballah fighters unexpectedly attacked Amal positions and attempted to occupy them. However, this attack was repulsed and fierce fighting ensued between the warring sides. According to preliminary figures, during this fighting more than 20 persons were killed in artillery fire and nearly 50 were wounded. Dozens of houses were badly damaged.

Tehran's reaction to this clash was immediate. Mohammad Besharati, the Iranian deputy foreign minister who was in Syria, met with the representatives of the hostile factions and asked them to declare a cease-fire. Amal and Hizballah ostensibly agreed on a cease-fire on Sunday. However, according to the latest reports, exchanges of fire continue in the Iqlim al-Tuffah region.

[Announcer] Some time ago, Amal and Hizballah signed a joint statement in Tehran on the normalization of their relations. Why have their differences once again come to a head?

[Andreyev] This kind of fighting has been the norm for quite a while and has been going on for over 2 years. It has resulted in a heavy casualty toll numbering hundreds on both sides. During this period, dozens of cease-fire agreements have been signed on the initiative of Iran and Syria. However, none of them lasted very long. Tyranny and injustice spawns more tyranny and injustice. One terrorist act breeds another. There is no trust between Amal and Hizballah. Talk of Shiite unity is nothing more than words. As a matter of fact, there is intense rivalry between the two factions on the question of leadership of the Shiites.

As far as is known, the present fighting is merely a new phase in this struggle.

[Announcer] What consequences are such clashes likely to have for the present explosive situation in Lebanon?

[Andreyev] Extremely serious repercussions. The fact is that these military operations take place in the vicinity of the Lebanese-Israeli border and this provides Tel Aviv with an excellent pretext for renewed interference in Lebanese affairs. In addition, these battles aggravate the situation in Lebanon. Iran can do a great deal to normalize the situation. We know that Tehran provides considerable financial and military assistance to the Hizballah grouping. The Iranian Government finances Hizballah to the tune of $100-150 million annually.

By using its influence, Iran can prevent Hizballah from fighting. The Lebanese situation is so complicated that it

demands immense restraint by all parties, and requires that saner counsels should prevail.

Economic Minister Katushev Ends Syrian Visit

LD2912145689 Moscow TASS in English 1408 GMT 29 Dec 89

[Text] Damascus December 29 TASS—A Soviet government delegation led by Konstantin Katushev, USSR Minister of Foreign Economic Relations and member of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, has completed its visit to the Syrian Arab Republic.

In the course of the visit Katushev met with Prime Minister Mahmud al-Zu'bi. Talks were held with Deputy Prime Minister for Economic Affairs Salim Yasin, Syrian Defence Minister Mustafa Talas, Minister of Economy and Foreign Trade Muhammad al-'Imadi, Minister of State for Planning Sabah Baqjaji and some other senior executives.

Participants in the talks discussed the state of Soviet-Syrian relations in various spheres and prospects for their development in the interests of the peoples of the two friendly states. They also discussed a number of issues of mutual interest.

Members of the delegation visited the construction site of the Tishrin thermal power plant, a major national economic project, that is being built near Damascus with Soviet technical assistance.

A protocol was signed on the results of the visit.

PLO's Policies Seen as 'Flexible, Constructive'

PM0101203590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jan 90 Second Edition p6

[Own correspondent A. Stepanov dispatch under the rubric "From the Scene of Events": "Under the Banner of Struggle; The Palestinian Resistance Movement Celebrates its 25th Anniversary"]

[Excerpts] Beirut—"President of the Palestinian State Yasir 'Arafat received 65 percent of the vote in the elections held in the occupied territories.... Following the announcement of the results of the vote, the police had to open fire on Israeli demonstrators in West Jerusalem.... There were also bitter clashes between subunits of the security forces and Israeli settlers by the prime minister's building...."

At the moment this is only a political forecast in fictional form published in the Israeli newspaper THE JERUSALEM POST. But the item itself is worthy of note. It reflects the new realities and aims to gradually get Israeli public opinion used to what must inevitably happen: the gaining of independence and statehood by the Palestinians. This is the logical course of events. The Palestinian resistance movement celebrates its 25th anniversary 1 January. It has gained new strength during the intifadah, the uprising in the Israeli-occupied lands. It takes peaceful forms and has grown on an unprecedented scale.

"If Israel is going to recognize 'Arafat as head of the Palestinian state after the elections, it might be better to do this before the elections, because he is supported by 80 percent of the Palestinians, after all, and it is simply essential that we begin talks with him and with the PLO." These words are no prophesy by futurologists but a sober assessment given by Israeli Minister of Science and Technology E. Weizman. [Passage omitted]

While bearing aloft the banner of resistance, the PLO also takes a highly flexible and constructive political stance. Recognizing Israel's right to existence and rejecting terrorism as a method of struggling for the Palestinian people's legal rights, the PLO expresses willingness to hold talks and supports the idea of convening an international conference on a Near East settlement in order to put an end to the prolonged confrontation once and for all.

East Europe

Shevardnadze Invited To Visit Romania

LD3012201989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1830 GMT 30 Dec 89

[Text] Bucharest, 30 Dec (TASS)—TASS correspondents Dmitriy Dyakov and Nikolay Morozov report:

Romania's minister of foreign afairs, S. Celac, gave an interview here today to correspondents from TASS and Soviet television.

At the beginning of the interview, the minister made an official statement: On 30 December, Romania's minister of foreign affairs, S. Celac, received the Soviet ambassador in Bucharest, Ye.M. Tazhelnikov, on the occasion of which he handed an invitation to E.A. Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, to pay an official visit to Romania in the first 10 days of January. The same day, the Soviet side announced that it agreed in principle.

Replying to the correspondents' questions, S. Celac noted that the main political substance of the forthcoming visit would, of course, be the Soviet minister's conversation with I. Iliescu, chairman of the National Salvation Front Council, and P. Roman, the prime minister. "I also hope that this will be an opportunity to become acquainted, since we shall be working together, and working in earnest."

In answer to a question on Romania's new political course, the foreign minister said that its main political essence was set out in the program of the National Salvation Front. This is the course to which the government will adhere. The basic directives contained in the Front's program create new and excellent conditions for

developing Romanian-Soviet relations at a higher level. This will be discussed in very specific terms during E.A. Shevardnadze's visit.

In conclusion, S. Celac emphasized that Romania intends to contribute to constructing the common European home.

Visit Set for 'Next Weekend'

LD3112205489 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 31 Dec 89

[Text] The Soviet foreign minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, will visit Romania next weekend. The deputy Romanian foreign minister, Corneliu Bogdan, has said in Bucharest Shevardnadze's forthcoming talks with the Romanian leaders have no fixed agenda. The two sides, said the Romanian diplomat, intend to lay a foundation for new and good Romanian-Soviet relations. He noted the visit would be the first Romanian-Soviet official contact since the overthrow of the Ceausescu regime.

Romania's Brucan on Former Leaders' Trial

LD2912212189 Moscow TASS in English 2104 GMT 29 Dec 89

[Text] Paris December 29 TASS—The situation in Romania is at present quite stable, though there are still groups of extremists who continue sniper fire in some cities, Silviu Brucan, a member of the Executive Committee of the National Salvation Front, said in an interview with the newspaper LE MONDE.

"The decision on an urgent trial of Nicolae Ceausescu and Elena Ceausescu and the execution of the military tribunal's sentence was absolutely right, and not only for the reason that we were striving to paralyse our adversaries," Brucan said.

"The Romanian people demanded that these former leaders die, and we were aware of this. A real threat was posed by the fact that officials of the security service loyal to Ceausescu were striving to free him, so risks should not be taken," he said.

"The decision to try the former leaders was passed in the evening of December 24 by the eleven-member Executive Bureau of the National Salvation Front. The names of Bureau's members, except for Ion Iliescu, Dumitru Mazilu and Petre Roman, cannot be given for reasons of their security. The military tribunal conducted the trial in the morning of December 25. Nicolae and Elena Ceausescu were executed at mid-day," he said.

"As to the Army on the whole, we have always been confident in our military, except perhaps several high commanders, who were immediately dismissed," Brugan said.

"We put on trial only those who committed crimes or those who are personally to blame for the present state of affairs in the country. We have no intentions of creating in Romania the atmosphere of revenge-seeking, even though some call for retribution. But I think this applies only to Ceausescu," Brucan said.

Romanian President Says Trust Growing

LD3012151189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1021 GMT 30 Dec 89

[Excerpt] The last week of the departing year is coming to an end, a week in an unusually hot winter month for the socialist countries in Central and Eastern Europe. Last Monday and Tuesday, people there did not go to work. But this time it was not because they were holding lengthy meetings or were on strike, but because, as at this time every year, they were celebrating one of the most beautiful, peaceful, and joyous festivals—Christmas. But it was an unusual Christimas.

The democratic transformations that took place before our very eyes in the German Democratic Republic and then, immediately afterward, in Czechoslovakia, can be compared with a wave that swept away the old customs which had taken root over the decades. Glasnost, democracy, and freedom were triumphant. The wave rolled on to Bulgaria too, where it put an end to absolute rule, initiated processes of renewal, and where people are now preparing for democratic elections.

But a tragedy occurred in Romania. The spring of dictatorship that has been compressed for a quarter of a century could withstand no more pressure. The people freed itself from the authoritarian regime of Ceausescu. But quite a lot of blood was spilled. Over 60,000 people died. There was bitterness and pain in the people's hearts, but at the same time there was joy too at the long-awaited liberation. It is reported from Bucharest that a lull has set in within the country. The work of forming a new Romanian Government goes on.

Describing the current situation inside the country, Ion Iliescu, chairman of the Council of Romania's National Salvation Front, said in part:

[Begin recording] [Iliescu] The regime of Ceausescu disrupted the economy, the social sphere, and so on. But at the same time, he created a very powerful system of repression, which is still operating in order to destabilize the country and create difficulties for organizing a new political structure, and in order to create difficulties for reorganizing and improving the economy. Now there are some tendencies toward disrupting...

[Unidentified correspondent interrupting] Sabotage?

[Iliescu] Anarchic...

[Correspondent interrupting] diversions?

[Iliescu] Both diversions and sabotage. At the same time, there is reciprocity and trust between the new forces, the front, and the old apparatus, which is becoming stronger. This is one of the features and difficulties of the present situation. So for us the main thing now is to create new

organizational structures. There are some positive circumstances. Specifically, there is the general consensus of all the forces that took part in overthrowing the regime. There is now a new program for the National Front, which is open to all strata in Romanian society: The creation of a real, social, all-embracing front of all healthy forces in society in order to renew the country. [end recording] [passage omitted]

Romania's Bogdan on Improving Soviet Relations

LD3012180789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 30 Dec 89

[Text] At our request, a reporter of the newspaper TRUD in Bucharest has interviewed Corneliu Bogdan, Romanian secretary of state, in other words, foreign minister.

[Unidentified Reporter] To a question concerning the prospects for the development of Romanian-Soviet relations, he replied: After the start of perestroyka in the USSR, the position of the Nicolae Ceausescu regime was one that seriously hampered all-around political and economic development in Romanian-Soviet ties. Now, since our victory, a new foundation has been created for Romanian-Soviet relations, which will facilitate their active development.

In reply to the question on the most important problem now facing the country's leadership, the minister said: The main task of domestic policy is, first and foremost, to improve the lives of the people. Of course, to create a new structure of authority, elections must be held. They are scheduled for the spring. People await improvements and we must justify their hopes, the minister said. Another problem for the new leadership, he noted, is to achieve nationwide consensus. Unfortunately, many people in Romania believe communists bear responsiblity for Ceausescu's methods of government. However, during the combat actions frequently it was precisely communists who were killed and wounded by the terrorists' bullets. For example, in the city of Brasov, precisely 75 percent of those hit by the bullets of the forces loyal to Ceausescu were communists.

We were speaking about various domestic political problems, but I asked the minister to talk about the international activity of his ministry, about what foreign policy path the country would follow in the future. Romania must, of course, return the respect of the whole world, Corneliu Bogdan said. We regard ourselves as part of the common European home, which must be strengthened. As for our international obligations, we will, of course, fulfil them.

In conclusion, the Romanian foreign minister noted that moral and material aid is of enormous significance for the whole country. He also stated that the aid from the Soviet Union is of great significance. We are grateful to all countries for organizing this support, which we need so much.

Bogdan on European Home

PM0101165990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with Corneliu Bogdan, minister and state secretary with the Romanian Foreign Ministry, by IZVESTIYA special correspondents V. Volodin and M. Krushinskiy in Bucharest "on New Year's Eve" under the rubric "IZVESTIYA Interview": "Corneliu Bogdan: Build a European Home Together"]

[Text] "With the collapse of the Ceausescu regime, the obstacles to successfully developing relations between Romania and the Soviet Union have fallen away," Corneliu Bogdan, minister and state secretary with the Romanian Foreign Ministry, told our special correspondents.

He received us on New Year's Eve in the Foreign Ministry building on Bucharest's Victory Square. Assessing, at our request, the history of the development of relations between our countries and the present status of these relations, the minister said:

"Mikhail Gorbachev's coming to power and the implementation of the perestroyka policy in the Soviet Union gave rise to serious difficulties in relations between Romania and the Soviet Union. It is quite obvious that, being opposed to everything new, Ceausescu also openly opposed perestroyka. All this caused serious obstacles in our relations from the very outset. Therein lay the main paradox of the situation created at that time. Meanwhile, the so-called 'Brezhnev doctrine,' which existed before M.S. Gorbachev's election, also impeded the successful development of relations between our two countries. Then it disappeared. But, unfortunately, the contradictions remained.

"Now the main obstacles have been removed. We can cooperate normally in the political, economic, and all other spheres. I can see good prospects for this. Take the economic sphere, for example. I know there have been serious problems in the past with establishing direct ties between the two countries' industrial enterprises. Unfortunately, I have been unable to get to the heart of this problem in the last 2 days. There are too many conversations and meetings with representatives of the foreign press. You are among the first I have received, but I still have a lot of meetings and news conferences ahead of me. Still, it is to be expected, as we have been silent for so long."

[Correspondents] What are the prospects for Romanian cooperation within the framework of the Warsaw Pact?

[Bogdan] Many are asking this question. I have been asked this very same question by British television representatives, for example. For some reason, many are having doubts in this connection. It is common knowledge that, from the very first months, the program platform of the Romanian National Salvation Front has said that we intend to abide firmly by our alliance

commitments. In this respect, the commitments stemming from Romania's membership of the Warsaw Pact have been specially emphasized. The former Romanian leadership, for example, had the habit of alluding to the conducting of military maneuvers in neighboring countries as a factor impeding the favorable development of relations. We now believe that the staging of these maneuvers does not present any particular problem.

[Correspondents] What is your opinion on the prospects of cooperation in Europe?

[Bogdan] In past years, as Romanian ambassador to the United States, I have carried out private research on the problems of Europe as a whole and all-European cooperation. Now the prospects in this sense are better than they have ever been before. The Ceausescu regime was opposed to the idea of creating a common European home. But that was a stupid attitude to take. After all, this "home" has an objective existence that does not depend on whether we wish it or not. Our two sides, our peoples are the inhabitants of this home. It is up to us to ensure that the roof of this home does not leak, that the walls do not let in the cold winds, and that life inside it is organized on the basis of the rules of good neighborliness. This can only be achieved by cooperating with the whole of Europe.

I will honestly say: The time has come to play a more active role in all-European cooperation and to eliminate differences in different countries' views. I will say, not as a minister but as a researcher of international problems: The so-called "Brezhnev doctrine" aimed to divide Europe. And the administrative-edict systems that existed in East European countries were geared to the same aim. But the times are changing. The old approaches are being replaced by new ones. Now, without superfluous illusions, we can move forward, creating new pan-European structures. I think that these structures will predominate in politics. I think that, in parallel with this, the importance of military blocs will begin to wane. The time will come when the Soviet Union will become a member of the European Parliament. That will be a time of ardent joint work for all us Europeans. However, we will not attain this aim if we do not work together now. That is my personal view.

Romanian Government Holds First Session

LD3012182489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1720 GMT 30 Dec 89

[Text] Bucharest, 30 Dec (TASS)—TASS correspondents Dmitriy Dyakov, Vadim Malyutin and Nikolay Morozov report:

The basic tenets contained in the program of the National Salvation Front create new, marvellous conditions for the development of relations on a higher level between Romania and the Soviet Union. S. Celac, Romanian foreign minister, talked about this today in an interview with correspondents of TASS and Soviet Television. Romania intends to contribute to the construction of the pan-European home, he said.

Today the first session of the new Romanian Government was held. Its participants discussed the basic tasks of the present stage of the country's development and the forthcoming transformations in economic, sociopolitical, and cultural life. The formation of the government, in which there are still vacant posts, continues.

Many ministries and departments have already set about practical activity. Your TASS correspondent has been to the Ministry of Agriculture and the Food Industry. One of our main tasks at present, V. Surdu, minister-state secretary, said, is to clear up the real state of the agrarian sector of the national economy. Many indices published up to now have turned out to be inflated by 12 to 15 times, but in actual fact the situation in the industry can be evaluated as a catastrophic, crisis one. The revolution has opened up to us the possibility of broad cooperation with the Soviet Union, which was preserved artificially under the dictatorship. In these difficult days for us we hope very much for the aid of the Soviet Union.

Foreign journalists today were given the opportunity to visit the pompous Palace of the Republic, erected on the instruction of the dictator, which was supposed to become the grandiose monument to the "Ceausescu epoch." It is not for nothing that the monumental building with richly decorated rooms inside, reflecting the thirst for luxury and bad taste of the tyrant, is called the "pharaoh's" by the city's inhabitants.

The Otopeni International Airport is only receiving planes with humanitarian aid sent to Romania, which is continuing to arrive in the country in a broad stream. The mass media are reporting the recognition of the National Salvation Front Council by various governments and states.

Romanian Premier Cited on Ties With Warsaw Pact

PM0101151390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 1

[IZVESTIYA Press Service roundup: "Romania: The Battle Is Not Over Yet"]

[Text] The Romanian Supreme Military Council has made an appeal to the people which says that patriotic forces are in full control of the situation throughout the country. It has also been announced that several thousand members of the Romanian secret service have surrendered to the authorities, but that several hundred fanatics loyal to Ceausescu are still in hiding and are trying to destabilize the situation. Diplomatic circles say that the battle is not yet over.

Romanian Prime Minister P. Roman said in an interview for the Paris paper LA CROIX-EVENEMENTS: We have established a very good mutual understanding

with the Soviet leadership. We have received very eloquent confirmation from Moscow on this score. The new Romanian leadership has explained the purpose of its actions to all our partners and all our friends. They all understand.

We intend to be involved actively in building the common European home. We are opting for European integration in the economic, cultural, and spiritual spheres. We favor close and permanent cooperation with the EEC. What Romania needs first and foremost from abroad is fraternal support. We have already received vast amounts of humanitarian assistance and it considerably exceeds our needs. In the future, of course, we will need to import modern technology—the Ceausescu regime left the country in ruins... We do not want to bring into government top officials who served Ceausescu. But some of those who worked with him are very competent people. We need them. The main hope now rests with young people—the engine behind the Romanian revolution.

Asked whether he considered the execution of Ceausescu too hasty, Roman said: "We had no option. Ceausescu's people were already getting ready to carry out an operation to seize him, involving a group of special paratroopers. If they had succeeded in releasing him there would have been carnage."

In an interview for the British television company ITN, First Deputy Foreign Minister Bogdan said that Romania will continue to play the "same constructive role" in the Warsaw Pact as long as the organization exists. "We will continue to advocate the mutual disbandment of military blocs in Europe. In the meantime, we will keep our pledges." He expressed the view that Romanian-Soviet relations will steadily improve.

The Romanian Embassy in Switzerland has sent a note to the authorities asking for a search for funds belonging to the family of former president Ceausescu. In the very near future the Romanian Government will be making an official request in this connection.

According to unverified data, there are around $400 million in Swiss bank accounts, mainly in the form of gold bullion, transferred to Switzerland by the Ceausescu family. A preliminary order to freeze the accounts was issued by the Department of Justice and the police at the end of last week. The reaction of the major banks to which the order was specifically addressed varied. The Schweizerische Bankgesellschaft declined to answer, stating that by admitting or denying that it had Ceausescu's money in its accounts it would be violating bank secrecy. The Schweizerische Kreditanstalt said that it most probably did not have funds belonging to the former dictator in its accounts. A further careful check did not provide any confirmation on this score.

RCP Members Call for Disbandment of Party

PM3112202789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jan 90 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Vedrashko dispatch: "Rapid Changes"]

[Text] Bucharest, 31 Dec—Even the most nonchalant observers are calling the changes taking place in Romania breathtaking. They are being felt by millions of Romanians. Houses have become warmer. The price of domestic electricity has been reduced. State stores are now offering foodstuffs which most citizens could not even have dreamed of in the recent past: beef, sausages, ham, coffee, oranges, and much more.

There is no euphoria, however; everyone realizes that the country owes the first results largely to emergency measures associated with the halting of food exports, the arrival of massive humanitarian support of various kinds from abroad, and intensive efforts to stabilize the situation, which gives no grounds for complacency.

What is the people's mood at such a critical time for the country and do they trust the new authorities? A public opinion poll conducted by Romanian sociologists at barricades and checkpoints among the defenders of the revolution showed that out of 232 people, 56% were familiar with the National Salvation Front's program, 37% had some idea of what the program says, and 7 percent were unacquainted with it. One-half of those questioned reckon that the principal task now is to reorganize the economy, and one-fifth said that political reorganization was the main task. Asked whether they are going to work better from now on, 97% said yes. The degree of confidence or lack of confidence in the future is shown by the answer to the question: Will our children have a better life? Ninety-four percent said yes, 6% said no.

An action group comprised of Romanian Communist party [RCP] members today published a statement admitting that the Ceausescu dictatorship totally compromised the party in the eyes of the people and of history, making a mockery of socialist ideals and socialism's fundamental values. The statement's authors appeal to all party members to convene an emergency congress to decide on the RCP's self-disbandment and the transfer of all the party's funds and property to the Romanian people—via the National Salvation Front Council.

It is a sad historical fact that Romania's repressive apparatus acted with such force that there could be no question of any political leadership of the people's masses. That is why, during the revolution, the RCP was excluded from the struggle. A thorough analysis of the situation and of the correlation of forces in the country will, of course, be made very soon. A precise appraisal of the realities is needed for further action, but meanwhile it is the New Year holiday. Amid the joy of an entire people and the grief and tears of tens and hundreds of

thousands of mothers, fathers, brothers and sisters, sons and daughters. As Romanians everywhere celebrate, they do not forget all the individuals who suffer. Today's front page of the newspaper ROMANIA LIBERA carries an appeal to all citizens to take in orphaned children left without anyone to look after them.

Press Treatment of Ceausescu's Romania Hit

PM0101152790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Jan 90 Second Edition p 3

[Article written specially for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA by TASS political observer Sergey Kulik: "Downfall. Revolutionary Explosion in Romania and Fall of Ceausescu Clan as Reflected in World's Press"]

[Excerpt] As the shooting, intermingled with the triumphant shouts of the victorious people, dies down and as definite constants finally emerge in Romania's political life—which is changing with kaleidoscopic rapidity—the time has come to ponder what happened, and why, in this country which is so close to us not only formally—geographically—but also by its very essence—historically, spiritually.

I reckon I am not the only one who will long see before his eyes the pictures that flashed onto the television screens: first of all, dozens of children, squashed candles in stiff hands, crushed by tanks and shot at point-blank range by the brutal members of hit squads; then, Ceausescu's body sprawled on the ground. The news on the Romanian revolution which has swamped the pages of the press gives rise to a whole heap of questions. And foremost among them, I am sure, regardless of how it is formulated, is essentially this: "How could such events—the bloodiest in all postwar European history—take place in a country calling itself the Socialist Republic of Romania?" And then a mass of perplexity arises. Why has a person who yesterday was esteemed as general secretary of the Communist Party today begun to be called a dictator? How did it suddenly happen that the Socialist Republic of Romania was ruled not by the Romanian Communist Party but by some "Ceausescu clan"? Why was the tyranny in Romania passed off as democracy and the veritable absolutism as scientific socialism?

If we are to speak about our press, it seems to me that, while utilizing glasnost to illuminate the Soviet reality and going whole hog in depicting our own recent past and present, we sometimes still halt at the USSR state border and do not venture to call by its proper name that which is happening in our immediate environs. As regards Romania, the recent adherence to the principle of the ideologization of politics also probably had its impact, subconsciously suggesting as it were: It is more advantageous in the propaganda respect to write untruths about "Socialist Romania" than to write the truth about the fact that the Romanian reality has increasingly little to do with socialism. [passage omitted]

Romanian New Year Holiday Preparations Described

LD3112205389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 31 Dec 89

[Text] The New Year holiday is being celebrated by a free Romania, which has thrown off the yoke of dictatorship. Life in the country is getting back to normal. This is what our correspondent Sergey Zheleznyak reports from Bucharest.

[Zheleznyak] For the moment it is difficult to say what New Year's Eve will be like in Bucharest, but the authorities are trying to do everything so that nothing will darken the bringing-in of the New Year. On instructions from the Council of the National Salvation Front, a statement has been made on Romania's radio and television that Army units and detachments of patriotic guards are completely in charge of the situation in all towns and population centers in the country. The majority of the former security service officials who remained faithful to Ceausescu either have surrendered, been annihilated, or been taken prisoner. However, individual fanatical elements still remain, which are prepared to commit new crimes of terrorism.

Tonight, the military command is asking the population not to use firecrackers or noisemakers, in order to avoid dangerous misunderstandings. In my opinion, this is virtually the only restriction the Romanians will see in the coming New Year's Eve. For the first time in many years it is warm in the houses. The limits on electrical power have been lifted. The exorbitant tariff which provided for a fantastic rise in the price of each kilowatt expended over and above the norm has been abolished. It is pleasant to look at the illuminated shop windows with products which until quite recently one could only buy in Romania in special shops trading in dollars.

Everywhere one senses an atmosphere of freedom, of being unfettered. People have come out of a state of apathy. They are hanging great hopes on the revolution. I spent some time at the Council of the National Salvation Front of the first sector—to put it more simply, the first district of Bucharest. I talked with its chairman, 34-year-old design engineer Bogden Petrascu, and with other members of the Council. I saw how many problems they have today, and with what difficulty the normalization of life is being achieved. We understand very well that it is simpler to take power than to keep it, said Comrade Petrascu. For this reason, the main thing for us now is to create economic foundations for the new authority. Previously, in the years of dictatorship, people worked under the pressure of fear. We must now convince them to work consciously. A 3-day holiday has been declared in Romania on the occasion of the New Year. Where will the Council members spend them, I asked. Here at work, they replied. It is necessary to do everything in order that people sense that a new life will arrive with this New Year.

New Year's Scenes

LD0101194590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 1 Jan 89

[Text] Our correspondent Sergey Zheleznyak reports from the capital of Romania.

[Zheleznyak] The residents of Bucharest celebrated the New Year in a calm manner. However, just as before, tanks and armored cars are in the city's squares and streets. At the entrances to state institutions and at enterprises, the fighting men of the Romanian Army, together with representatives of the patriotic subunits, are making careful checks of documents and are conducting individual searches of citizens. People perceive this as a necessary condition for their own safety. They joke with the soldiers and wish them a happy New Year. They bring them seasonal fare from their homes such as pies, fruit, and hot tea. A festive mood is felt throughout. And it would probably not be an exaggeration to say that it is an especially festive mood, because for the first time in more than 20 years they are celebrating the New Year free of the fear created and aroused by the dictator's regime. The word "freedom"—libertate—is written on placards, on the walls of houses, even on the snowmen that the children have built in the streets.

Today and tomorrow are rest days in Romania, but public life is not dying down. In the conference hall of the biggest hotel in the city, the (Intercontinentale), one press conference follows another. Present are journalists who have flown to Bucharest from all over the planet. These press conferences are being organized by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, presenting to journalists the various parties and political groupings that came into being after the revolution. Every sizeable party is granted the right to appear on television and broadcast on radio. The Social Democratic Pasrty, the Democrats, the Liberals, the Democratic-Ecological Party, the Christian Democrats, and the Christian Party have already announced their creation and broadcast their program.

The initiative group of the Romanian Communist Party has already come out with a declaration in which the victory of the revolution is welcomed. It is noted that the Ceausescu dictatorship completely subordinated the activities of the party to its ambitions, deprived the ideals of socialism of their content, and distorted socialism's fundamental values. In the declaration, complete support for the program of the National Salvation Front is announced, and it is acknowledged that in the years of the dictatorship the Romanian Communist Party compromised itself in the face of history and the people. It is proposed that an extraordinary congress of the party be convened in the near future in order to dissolve it and to hand over all the party's property to the people through the National Salvation Front. It is intended to set up a new organization that will take part in the forthcoming elections.

Bulgarian Paper Interviews Shevardnadze

AU2912170789 Sofia ZEMEDELSKO ZNAME in Bulgarian 28 Dec 89 pp 1,4

[Interview with USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze by NOVOSTI Press Agency special correspondents Vladimir Markov and Stanislav Polzinov "at request of ZEMEDELSKO ZNAME": "On Road Toward Truly United Europe"—date and place not given]

[Text] [Question] At present, many things are happening in politics for the first time. In Brussels recently, you paid your first ever visit to NATO Headquarters. Also, for the first time in history, you signed an agreement on trade and economic cooperation between the USSR and the EEC. What is the significance of this agreement?

[Shevardnadze] With no exaggeration, the fact that this agreement was reached may be regarded as a breakthrough that permits a start to be made on a new stage in our country's drawing closer to the 12 EEC member states and in surmounting the economic schism in Europe. This framework agreement contains answers to the questions concerning the further development of business cooperation—on the basis of mutually granting one another the most-favored-nation status, without unnecessary restrictions. The Soviet Union can obtain a lot from the EEC member countries.

On the other hand, I have no doubt that Western Europe is very interested in developing business relations with the Soviet Union.

Thanks to the process of integration in Western Europe, an exceptionally powerful economic center is being created which, according to certain indicators, will even exceed the United States or Japan. In concluding an agreement with the USSR, the EEC member countries have taken a clever step: They have secured for themselves an entry into an immense and reliable market.

[Question] Until recently, NATO was not prepared to establish contacts with representatives of Warsaw Pact countries.

[Shevardnadze] I will point out that the decision to organize the meeting in NATO Headquarters with the Soviet foreign minister was adopted by NATO collectively. My talks with NATO Secretary General Manfred Woerner and with the leaders of the permanent representations of the member countries at NATO Headquarters were interesting and rich in content. Both these and other talks held in Brussels reflect the processes of drawing together and democratization that are under way on an all-European scale. These processes are leading to an improvement in the mutual understanding between all the European countries and consistently serve to overcome the confrontation in Europe.

[Question] Within NATO lately, the discussion has intensified on the new structures and tasks of this organization. U.S. Secretary of State James Baker spoke

more specifically about this. How do you evaluate this discussion, including in the light of the further contacts between the Warsaw Pact and NATO?

[Shevardnadze] I consider that such a formulation of the issues within NATO is completely correct. The times require that the role of the political aspects in the activity of the two alliances should be heightened. We in the Warsaw Pact have already been talking for some time about the need for the greater politicalization of the two alliances, and we are restructuring ourselves in all seriousness. The conclusion may be drawn from my talks at NATO Headquarters that there they too are thinking seriously about the future role of the two alliances and about the interrelations between them.

Our dialogue with NATO will continue. In general, a mechanism for developing relations between the Warsaw Pact and NATO has already been created and, what is more, a permanently acting one. This is the same mechanism that was set in motion to hold the talks on conventional arms and forces in Europe. The discussion on military doctrines which will start in the middle of January 1990 in Vienna is of exceptional importance, including with reference to the further relations between the Warsaw Pact and NATO. This discussion may become a basis for a transition in the relations between the two alliances from confrontation to cooperation.

[Question] How would you define the present and forthcoming stages in the development of East-West relations in Europe, bearing in mind more specifically the changes now taking place in Eastern Europe?

[Shevardnadze] We reached the conclusion that the "cold war" has ended. A period of peace is beginning in Europe's development. However, this does not mean that everything will run smoothly. Especially against the background of the major changes now taking place in Eastern Europe, it is important now, as never before, for the European countries to demonstrate their desire and readiness to do everything necessary to preserve and strengthen the stability of the European Continent.

Now all of us—the states in Europe, the United States, and Canada—share a positive concern that no question mark should be placed over the continent's stability. The calm, normal development of the common European process is precisely the way that leads to the creation of a truly united Europe.

Progress along this path is being achieved in all directions. Nonetheless, the most perceptible of these is the trend toward overcoming military confrontation. And this is the main thing. If we succeed in the way we have foreseen in completing the talks in Vienna, then we will sense a quite different atmosphere on the Continent of Europe.

Ecology is a further exceptionally important field of cooperation. Prerequisites have now been created for taking the first steps in the field of ecological security. We believe that the approaching ecological catastrophe poses an even greater threat than nuclear weapons. The disarmament process has begun and negotiations are in progress. However, civilization has yet to find an answer to the ecological threat and has not yet become fully aware of it. We must make progress in reducing the nuclear arsenals in order to allocate resources to finding bolder solutions to the ecological problems.

Albanians Urged To 'Follow Romania's Example'

PM0101210790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jan 90 Morning Edition p1

[Item from roundup of TASS, REUTER, UPI reports: "Pretender Reminds People of His Existence"]

[Text] Leka I, pretender to the royal throne in Albania and currently living in the Republic of South Africa, has urged Albanians to follow Romania's example. The pretender has called on them to seize this moment when important changes are taking place in Eastern Europe.

CPCZ Leaders Thank Gorbachev for Greeting

LD3012172289 Moscow International Service in Czech 1600 GMT 30 Dec 89

[Text] Ladislav Adamec, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia [CPCZ] chairman, and Vasil Mohorita, first secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, have sent a telegram to Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The telegram says the following:

Dear Mikhail Sergeyevich, we thank you sincerely for your cordial congratulations on our election to high-ranking posts in the CPCZ leadership. We will work to renew the party on democratic principles, and to change it into a modern left-wing political force which will fight for democratic socialism. We are convinced that our joint efforts to renew and restructure socialism will create good conditions for furthering cooperation and exchanging experience between our fraternal parties.

Please accept our heartfelt good wishes for the New Year, dear Mikhail Sergeyevich, and for success in your responsible work for socialism, peace, and friendship between the Czechoslovak and Soviet people.

Supreme Soviet Wishes Havel Success in CSSR

PM0201103990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium congratulations to new Czechoslovak President Vaclav Havel]

[Text] To President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic Vaclav Havel

We congratulate you on your election as president of the CSSR.

We believe that in the current period of profound changes relations between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia will develop in a spirit of friendship, cooperation, good-neighborliness, and allied collaboration between the two countries in the interests of strengthening peace and stability in Europe.

We wish you success in your activity in the lofty state office for the benefit of Czechoslovak society.

[Signed] USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

Soviet Central Newspapers View New CSSR President

PRAVDA Profiles Havel

PM0101145990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[Report by PRAVDA special correspondent A. Krushinskiy under general heading: "New CSSR President Elected"]

[Text] Prague-Moscow, December— ...Few people only 3 weeks ago would have predicted that he would become president. As recently as 1 December, in the ratings compiled by experts at the Prague Institute for the Study of Public Opinion, V. Havel occupied fourth place, with 10 percent of the votes, on the basis of a sociological survey. Even on 12 December, after a second poll, he was only second. Since then, on the one hand, many compromising facts about the former leadership of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia [CPCZ] have come to light and, on the other hand, a new political force, Civic Forum, with very vigorous support from striking students, launched a powerful campaign in support of Havel, as a man who spent 20 years resolutely exposing that leadership's policy. In mid-December, support for Havel's candidacy in Prague and in a number of other centers became almost unanimous.

Vaclav Havel is 53. He comes from a well-to-do family (for instance, before the revolution, it owned the Barrandov Movie Studio). He began his working life as a laboratory assistant, was then graduated from a higher educational establishment, and became a dramatist. In the seventies and eighties, his plays were staged only abroad. In his own country, he was known chiefly as one of the authors of the banned "Charter-77." As recently as this February, he was sentenced to 9 months' imprisonment for participating in the January student demonstration. In the past 2 decades, journalists have estimated, he has spent around 5 years in prison.

So by the time the first 3 weeks of December were over the situation had become rather complex: Students and the general public (particularly in Prague) were demanding the election of Havel. But for this to happen, he would have to obtain at least three-fifths of the votes in the Federal Assembly, where most of the deputies are CPCZ members. This explains the election delay. The deputies decided to set about electing a president after an extraordinary congress of the CPCZ so that this forum might predetermine the Communist deputies' line of conduct. Its decision, as PRAVDA has already recorded, was: Let them act in accordance with the will of their voters.

The delay was of definite benefit to the presidential contender himself. He was active in the press, on television, and at various news conferences. His manner is natural and candid. What he says is coherent and well-thought-out. He describes himself as one who does not belong to any party and does not subscribe to any ideology. The many leaflets bearing his picture, which have been pasted up around the city, contain an expression of Havel's that is very popular at the moment: "Truth and love will conquer lies and hatred." What meaning is invested in these concepts?

Perhaps the fullest answer is given by a detailed interview Havel recently gave in the paper RUDE PRAVO. It is curious that when asked about his attitude toward the CPCZ he replied, one might say, in the spirit of the criteria in line with which the most active party members were preparing for their extraordinary congress: "I believe the task of Communists is to overhaul their party as quickly as possible, so that it renounces the totalitarian method of government and enters into a future pluralistic, democratic system like any other political force." The interview also touched on socialism. "The meaning of this word should be reevaluated," Havel said. "The ruling group used to describe as 'antisocialist' anything it did not like, anything that was inconvenient, anything that occurred spontaneously, and it identified itself with socialism.... Our ideas about the future, about a socially just and democratic system for society, should not be remote from the views of people who remain to this day adherents of socialism." He advocated a variety of forms of ownership: a Czechoslovakia with state, cooperative, joint-stock, self-management, and private (chiefly in the sphere of services and small-scale enterprise) forms of ownership.

Readers no doubt will be interested in Vaclav Havel's attitude toward the Warsaw Pact and the USSR. In a television appearance some time ago, he said that it is the West's turn to take the next steps toward the disbandment of military blocs in Europe.... Everyone wants the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia, but it should only take place in the context of the broader European situation.

I can testify to the fact that I have not seen any anti-Soviet leaflets in Prague this month. Something else is interesting too: The paper LIDOVE NOVINY, which has Vaclac Havel in its editorial collegium, has condemned attempts by certain elements in the country to "take revenge" on Communists.

...So the election took place in the Federal Assembly. All 323 deputies cast their votes, in accordance with the will of their voters, for Vaclav Havel. After an interval of nearly 3 weeks, the president's flag is flying again above Prague Castle. Further evidence that equal dialogue

among political forces makes it possible to find a way out of the most complex situations. It is serving the interests of the Czechoslovak people and the ideas of building a common European home.

IZVESTIYA Sees 'Great Vigor'

PM0101203990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jan 90 Morning Edition p3

[Own correspondent L. Kornilov dispatch: "Start of Presidency"]

[Text] Prague—CSSR President V. Havel has set about his work in his post with great vigor. It has been announced that he will visit the GDR and the FRG on 2 January at the invitation of M. Gerlach and R. von Weizsaecker.

The Czechoslovak mass media have also reported that on 1 January the president will announce an amnesty; the category of prisoners to which it applies is not yet known. In the evening of 29 December, V. Havel went with Portuguese President M. Soares, in the CSSR as a private individual, to Staromestske Square in the center of Prague, where a folklore festival was being held—symbolically called the Ball of National Harmony. A new head of the CSSR presidential office and three presidential advisers have been appointed, following a presidential decree. In accordance with the Constitution, V. Havel has also proclaimed the fall session of the CSSR federal government closed.

With the election of V. Havel and A. Dubcek to the highest leading positions, students at Prague's higher education establishments have ended their strike. "Now we have sufficient guarantees that the processes in Czechoslovakia are irreversible," a spokesman for the students, who have been on strike for the last 6 weeks, said.

The CSSR Finance Ministry has announced that from 1 January 1990 taxes are being brought down for "private entrepreneurs": people engaged in small-scale production or the provision of services with the permission of local authorities. It has been agreed with the preparatory committee of the Association of Czechoslovak Enterprises that taxes will be cut by 50 percent. And, for those people for whom this is the main activity, their taxes will be cut by a further 1,000 crowns per month per calendar year. The same principle will be applied when calculating taxes for 1989. The measure has been described as provisional, pending the adoption of a corresponding law.

'No Settling of Scores' Foreseen in CSSR

PM0101132590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 5

[L. Kornilov report: "Czechoslovakia—There Will Be No Settling of Scores"]

[Excerpt] J. Charnogurskiy [name as transliterated], first deputy chairman of the CSSR Government, told journalists on New Year's Eve that a law on political parties will be submitted in February. A new party will not require authorization by state organs. But parties pursuing nondemocratic aims—for example, parties seeking unlimited power which flouts the Constitution and the laws—will not be registered. Simultaneously with this it will be pointed out that no party can form its organizations and carry out work inside the Armed Forces, in institutions, schools, and suchlike. Party financing will be controlled.

People who like to attend rallies will acquire their own "Hyde Park" in towns and settlements. At these places it will be possible to hold demonstrations and so on, or merely engage in a public exchange of opinions.

At the same news conference Charnogurskiy emphasized two important things: he called the Warsaw Pact "the decisive guarantee of Czechoslovak security" and recalled V. Havel's words that "there must be no persecution of Communists." The state doesn't need timeservers, and it opposes the settling of personal scores, he said.

As far as these latter words are concerned, this is really so. A spirit more of conciliation than of a desire for reprisals now reigns in Czechoslovak society. But you do encounter all sorts of excesses, and it happens nonetheless that someone or other is endeavoring to organize a "Communist witch-hunt." But the state, "Civic Forum," and most other organizations are protesting against such attempts. And as far as, for example, the arrest of M. Stepan, former first secretary of Prague's Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Committee, is concerned, this is no settling of "personal scores" but merely the prelude to punishment (to be decided by a court of law, of course) for actions against the whole of society.

As a whole, this is the tone and coloration of the present new year in Czechoslovakia—soft and peaceful.

"Seven Days" Interviews CSSR's Dubcek

LD3112174489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 31 Dec 89

[Interview with CSSR Federal Assembly Chairman Alexander Dubcek by unidentified correspondent; date, place not given; from the "Seven Days" program presented by Eduard Sagalayev—live or recorded]

[Text] [Sagalayev] We present an interview with Alexander Dubcek, the author of probably the best known definition of socialism. In 1968 he headed the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and 20 years later he has become the chairman of the CSSR Federal Assembly.

[Interviewer] Your name is linked with a great deal in the political life of Czechoslovakia, first of all with the concept of socialism with a human face. What kind of socialism is this?

[Dubcek in Russian] In general, it's difficult to give a precise formulation of socialism. I believe that all the socialist countries which have described themselves as socialist are not at all socialist in essence. We are all seeking a path and a content for socialism, although I ought to say that we have obtained profound ideas which we must build upon, because the authentic ideas of Marxism which consist of democracy, the power of the people, democracy for all, social equality, the equality of nations, peoples, etc. —many of these most fundamental theories, I would even say principles, have not found expression in the practice of our socialist construction in a form which would attract the broad interest of the popular masses. The mistake was not in the authentic ideas, but in the practice, in the many deformations, and therefore I think that we must openly recognize that the practical actions of the communist parties in the socialist countries have not taken account of the very profound changes which have been and are taking place in the countries of the bourgeois democracy where, I should say, neither social movements nor democracy are any longer comparable with the capitalism which existed here during the time of our classics.

[Interviewer] Judging by what you have said, you are following our perestroyka with great interest and sympathy. But why do you think that the planned targets are meeting with so much difficulty?

[Dubcek] I would say this: The leadership of the CPSU Central Committee came forward with and entered into the tackling of this perestroyka very late, very late. In many of the socialist states the first signs had already appeared that it was necessary somehow to find ways to a renovative or some kind of movement in order to renew trust in socialism, and it is because this never met with any support in the Soviet leadership that things are so difficult with the remedy of Soviet perestroyka. Well, what can I say? I should like perestroyka in the Soviet Union to follow a successful course- - it is the correct path—and I should like it to be an irreversible course which receives the understanding of the people, and a successful path for the development of the national economy and the solution of the many national issues which are very complex there. In brief, I should like the Soviet man and the peoples of the Soviet Union to live better, more favorably, and for there to be peace, concord, and understanding among peoples and nations, for cooperation to become deeper; in brief, for us to be in the future, above all, people.

'Hooligans' Damage Soviet Gravestones in GDR

LD0101141890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1317 GMT 1 Jan 90

[Text] Berlin, 1 Jan (TASS)—TASS correspondent Konstantin Savvin reports:

On New Year's night, rioting hooligans damaged many graves in the Soviet pantheon in the town of Gera. Although a detail of Volkspolizei carried out control checks on the territory of the memorial cemetary until late in the evening, the criminals nevertheless managed to defile graves. As has been established, they knocked Soviet stars off 34 gravestones and overturned five other gravestones.

Last week an act of vandalism was perpetrated by unknown criminals against a monument to the Soviet soldier and liberator in Berlin's Treptower Park. Last Saturday, a mass public meeting was held on the territory of this memorial. Its participants made a resolute protest against anti-Soviet and nationalist actions, and warned against rightwing radical threat in the GDR.

PRAVDA Reports on 'Neofascist Trends' in GDR

PM0101202990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jan 90 Second Edition p6

[Own correspondent M. Podklyuchnikov dispatch under the rubric "From the Scene of Events": "Alarm Signal; Neofascists on the Offensive in the GDR"]

[Text] Berlin—Among the events in which GDR political life is so rich, one at the end of 1989 has drawn particular attention: participants in a regular "roundtable" sitting announced that there are neofascist trends in the country. It sounded an alarm.

It must be said that although hitherto the representatives of the 16 parties, social organizations, and civic movements discussing topical issues of the country's life at the "roundtable" have only managed to agree after long arguments, this time they displayed total unanimity. Everyone realizes that they cannot turn a blind eye to the neofascist threat.

There is considerable justification for voicing concern. The most recent fact attesting to the growing threat from the far right is the profanation of the memorial to the Soviet servicemen and liberators in Berlin's Treptower Park. This has caused justified indignation in the country.

However, even before this there were reports showing that the danger of neofascism is a real one. In the FRG, Republicans Party leader and one-time member of the SS Franz Schoenhuber has said that dozens of groups of his supporters are active in the GDR and that "tonnes" of propaganda material is being sent to them. The activity of West German neofascist organizations such as the infamous military sports "Hofman Group" [name as transliterated] and the National Democratic Party is spreading in the country.

Here are some of the latest facts. Irmgard Saidel [name as transliterated], director of the national memorial erected on the site of Hitler's former concentration camp at Buchenwald, told the press that he received a message signed by the "underground republican movement." The letter ended with the phrase: "Keep the furnaces (of the crematorium—M.P.) open; every shot is one Russian and one communist!" A letter written in the neofascist spirit has also been received by Harri Mueller, Rostock's

district prosecutor, who was the prosecutor at the trial of the recently exposed fascist war criminal Yakob Holtz [name as transliterated]. The authors of the letter demanded the prisoner's release. "We want everything to be as Hitler ordered," they wrote. A number of other statesmen, party figures, and antifascists have received threatening letters.

GDR television devoted one of its programs to the growing neofascist activity. A whole array of neofascist symbols, literature, badges, and stickers—items confiscated by the police—were shown on the screen. Whereas in 1988 the police conducted investigations into 44 cases of violent neofascist actions, this year the number of such cases had reached 144 by the end of November.

At present 1,100 people connected with various extreme right-wing actions liable to criminal prosecution are known to the police crime department. These people show particular aggression toward employees of bodies for the protection of order and toward members of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany-Party of Democratic Socialism, whose identity they ascertain from their party badges. The views of the neofascists are expressed in the brief slogan: "Foreigners out, communists to the wall!"

During the process of renewal in the GDR the Ministry of State Security and then its replacement, the National Security Administration, have been eliminated at the demand of civic movements. Their premises are sealed up. Representatives of the police crime department indicated at a press conference that access to the documents there should be made available as quickly as possible in the interests of combating the danger of neofascism. Glasnost is the most important precondition for organizing antifascist resistance in the GDR.

The statement on neofascist trends in the country adopted by the "roundtable" participants notes that there is every justification for alarm.

West Europe

Reportage on French Interior Minister's Visit

Joxe on Visit's Results

LD2912135889 Moscow TASS in English 1246 GMT 29 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 29 TASS—French Interior Minister Pierre Joxe described the current visit to the Soviet Union by the ministry's delegation as the beginning of a new stage in the development of cooperation between the two countries' law enforcement agencies.

The Soviet leadership's policy of democratisation, openness, and the building of a law-governed state has stimulated Franco-Soviet contacts at all levels, including among law enforcement agencies, he told a news conference here today.

The purpose of the current visit it not only to get a better idea of the activities of Soviet and French law enforcement agencies but also to map out ways to strengthen cooperation to combat the trafficking of narcotics, organised crime, and international terrorism, Joxe emphasised.

He said that, apart from talks in the USSR Interior Ministry, he was received by Aleksandr Yakovlev, secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, and by State Security Committee (KGB) Chairman Vladimir Kryuchkov.

The delegation members also visited the USSR Defence Ministry where they discussed in detail the rendering of aid in the event of large-scale disasters, keeping in mind the experience gained during the clean-up operations following the Armenian earthquake.

It was agreed to send Soviet specialists to France to study methods to organise civil defense and the training of appropriate personnel, the minister said.

Apart from Moscow, the French delegation has visited the old Russian cities of Vladimir and Suzdal and expects to visit Sverdlovsk in the Urals and Leningrad, where they will meet representatives of local authorities and law enforcement agencies.

Joxe, Bakatin Give News Conference

LD2912233289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 29 Dec 89

[Excerpts] A news conference was held today in the Press Center of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs by French Interior Minister Pierre Joxe and Soviet Internal Affairs Minister Vadim Viktorovich Bakatin. Here's an on-the-scene report by our correspondent Anatoliy Fedorov:

[Fedorov] The French delegation arrived in our country on 25 December. Since then, the delegation leader, Pierre Joxe, has been received by members of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee Yakovlev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Kryuchkov, minister [as heard] of the USSR KGB. Conversations were also held with Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Army General Govorov, head of USSR Civil Defense. The French interior minister laid a wreath at the grave of the Unknown Soldier by the Kremlin wall. Apart from Moscow, Pierre Joxe and his entourage saw the sights of Vladimir and Suzdal. And now, on today's agenda, a news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists:

[Begin recording] [Joxe in French, with superimposed Russian translation] As far as the present visit is concerned, one has to note the exceptional circumstances in which it is being held—not only given the situation in Europe, but also the state of Soviet-French relations. One of the decisive factors in the development of those relations and one of the main aspects in the Soviet

Government's policy is the idea of creating a law-governed state, the drawing up and implementation of new policies. It is natural that in its administrative practice and measures for ensuring public order the Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] bases itself on the concept of a state based on the rules of law. I share this approach, and that is why we have set up these meetings. I believe that such meetings will be useful. This year, when Mr. Gorbachev was in Paris, an agreement was signed on combating drugs. In September, we were present at a UN event connected with that same problem and there I had the opportunity to meet one of the Soviet Union's deputy internal affairs ministers and discuss the subject with him in detail. In the course of the present talks, which were distinguished by an atmosphere of openness and friendliness, we expressed a desire for cooperation between the two ministries of internal affairs in every area of mutual interest, especially on matters concerning the fight against drugs, organized crime and terrorism. We have signed a joint Soviet-French communique.

[Unidentified correspondent, in Russian] The newspaper ASAHI, Japan: I have two questions. What happened to the French collector who went missing in the summer? Secondly, there has been a growing danger of late in the Soviet Union from weapons in the hands of private individuals: where do they get these weapons?

[Bakatin] We still do not know what has become of Basmajian, although a great deal of work is being done—we have studied around 500 clues, or to be precise, 470 clues, and there are 8 working hypotheses. They differ in their degree of authenticity, as they say, but there are hypotheses which we think may help us clear up and solve the case.

We are looking for around 9,000 missing weapons. These are mainly weapons that have been stolen over many years from schools, shooting ranges, and Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy establishments, but unfortunately also from the Soviet Army, including the MVD system. I ought to mention that weapons have also been smuggled and brought in of late, though these are isolated instances. All of us probably have to step up the fight. [Passage omitted]

[Fedorov] A question from the All-Union-Radio to Mr Joxe: What is your attitude to the work of the Soviet militia? And a question to Comrade Bakatin: It is known that the level of technical equipment of a Soviet militiaman is 15-20 times lower than that of his Western colleague. Will any concrete steps be taken in this field jointly with France?

[Joxe] To give a brief general view, perestroyka and glasnost are understood by everyone, even those who do not speak Russian. At present, a certain policy is being undertaken in the economy, politics, internationnal relations and naturally all of this influences the organization and functioning of the public order forces. It was interesting for me to hear Mr Bakatin's view on what he is going to undertake; I was particularly interested in the new forms of work. Unfortunately, I cannot say anything about my attitude to the work of the Soviet militia because I don't know how things used to be before. Our meeting with Mr Bakatin lasted for 48 hours. [as heard] This is why I can only express my opinion on what I hear or see.

[Bakatin] The technical level of our militiamen's equipment is very low. We are not happy with it and, undoubtedldy, here we have fallen behind many countries, including France. To give a concrete answer to your question, in the course of our talks, the subject of assistance with regard to technical equipment was not mentioned and could not have been mentioned. We personally, however, are interested in receiving information on the technical level of the French Interior Ministry's equipment, at the least so as not to waste time or to re-invent the wheel, especially as the Second Congress of People's Deputies, which, as you know, has just finished, has supported the MVD proposal that it is necessary to pass a law that would allow the courts to accept as evidence that obtained by technical means. So the subject of the militiamen's technical equipment, from the category of idle talk so to speak, is now passing into a totally, how can I put it, concrete and very essential sphere of life. It is a fairly serious and lingering problem that requires large investment. I hope our cooperation with the French Interior Ministry will enable us to tackle this complex problem more competently. [end recording]

'Vremya' Report

LD2912225489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 29 Dec 89

[From "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A news conference was held in Moscow by French Interior Minister Pierre Joxe and USSR Internal Affairs Minister Bakatin. The news conference fell within the program of the French delegation's visit to the Soviet Union, the purpose of which has been to discuss issues relating to the development of cooperation in the field of combating crime. Both ministers replied to Soviet and foreign journalists' questions; after the news conference, they met a Vremya film crew.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified correspondent] You have already had meetings and talks, at which the joint struggle against drugs, organized crime, drug addiction and terrorism and the practical introduction of the latest achievements of science and technology were topics of particular interest. I should just like to know what ways you see of implementing those prospects that are been mapped out at the present time?

[Joxe, in French with superimposed translation in Russian] As far as our joint action is concerned, I should like to cite a specific example. In July, when Mr. Gorbachev

was in Paris, we signed our first agreement on combating drug addiction. This is a very grave problem throughout the world. I now have met my counterpart, Minister Bakatin. Together, we must search for ways of acting against crime that we can pursue together. I have known my other counterparts for many years now: the British home secretary, the internal affairs ministers of Spain and Italy. For this reason, I regard the incipient contacts with your country to be invaluable and believe that these contacts should expand in line with our common interests, for example, in such areas as air transport security and the struggle against terrorism.

[Bakatin] This visit obviously should be seen from the point of view of the logic behind the development of perestroyka—the logic of the construction of a state based on the rule of law. Any contacts and examination of the experience of countries which have a wealth of experience in building democracy—and you know, in France this goes back more than 200 years—and also the great, world-renowned reputation of the French police.... This is very useful to us in speeding up these processes. Speaking personally, I was struck profoundly by Mr. Joxe's approach. Without bothering with the formal signing of protocols or the issuing of documents, he sets about establishing personal contacts and stimulating ties between specific officials who are responsible for specific jobs. I believe that this visit is valuable for this reason. This is the start of some great joint work which—and I am firmly convinced of this—will help raise the level and effectiveness of the work of our Soviet militia. [end recording] [Video shows the news conference, at which Gerasimov is visible, followed by the two interviews]

USSR-Spanish Trade Deal 'Blocked' by U.S.

PM2912150989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[Dispatch by own correspondent V. Volkov: "Cocom Ban"]

[Text] Madrid, 27 Dec—A contract signed by the Spanish firm Ceselsa for delivery to the USSR of equipment for an air traffic control system designed for installation at Moscow's Sheremetyevo Airport unexpectedly has been blocked. A veto on the deal was imposed by the U.S. representative in COCOM (coordination committee fo: the control of exports to socialist countries).

Reporting the ban, the influential Spanish newspaper EL PAIS writes that the embargo imposed by the U.S. representative who, incidentally, until recently was the U.S. ambassador to Madrid, is puzzling. After all, it is a case of equipment for a civilian airport, which is widely used in Spain.

Ceselsa specialists have told the newspaper's correspondent that the proposed package's inclusion of two computers from the U.S. firm Hewlett Packard, which are allegedly banned by Cocom organs for export to the socialist countries, served as the pretext for using the "straitjacket" in which Washington would like to "swaddle" this trade deal. But in the opinion of Spanish engineers, the Soviet Union has long had computers of this generation and makes extensive use of them.

The complexity of the situation in which the Spanish firm has found itself is also explained by the fact that the basic equipment, which makes up 96 percent of the total cost of the contract, has already been installed at Sheremetyevo Airport. It cannot operate, however, without the computers which are the electronic brain for the entire system.

The newspaper reports that the Spanish Ministries of Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Industry are conducting intense consultations with the U.S. Administration about unblocking the problem which has arisen. We shall see how successful these appeals are. But irrespective of the results, you cannot help asking: How long will trade deals between two sovereign states depend on the "say-so" of the White House?

Latin America & Caribbean

Further Reportage on Panama Developments

Vatican Embassy Situation Viewed

LD2912223689 Moscow TASS in English 2134 GMT 29 Dec 89

[Text] Panama City December 29 TASS—By TASS correspondent Eldar Abdullayev:

A resolute protest against U.S. military's acts of aggression and provocation in the immediate neighborhood of the Vatican's Embassy in Panama was expressed on behalf of the Vatican by the Pope's envoy Jose Sebastian Laboa.

The United States have no legal or moral grounds for their provocative behaviour that seriously hampers the discharge of the mission by the Vatican's Embassy, harbours a threat to the staff's personal safety and irritates the neighbourhood's residents who express indignation at the noise made by tanks and helicopters.

The statement stresses that at present the Vatican envoy is making every effort to convince General Noriega to leave the residence of his own accord, however there is no international law permitting the use of force with respect to any individual hoping for a political asylum.

The envoy admitted that the new Panamanian Government had not officially requested the extradition of Noriega.

The Vatican and Pope John Paul personally are, as before, categorically against the extradition of General Noriega to the United States and favour his extradition to the Panamanian authorities or another state, he noted.

In recent hours, the Vatican's envoy said, talks with Washington proceeded in a quieter atmosphere because the positions and criteria of both sides had been made clear.

The situation around the Vatican's Embassy continues tense and unpredictable. The blockade is being tightened, new units are being brought in, the search of cars and inspection of papers of local residents and foreigners is toughened at the regular checkpoints reinforced with tanks and armoured vehicles.

The stadium of the San-Augustin College located within 200 meters of the Vatican's Embassy has been arbitrarily turned by U.S. troops into a landing ground for helicopters bringing in reinforcements in troops and equipment.

Rumours are being spread about Noriega's possible suicide caused by his alleged depression. Washington's ultimatum decision to stop, including by force, any attempt to extradite Noriega to Panamanians or third countries is being reiterated.

The local authorities discovered the bodies of two American hostages taken in the first day of the intervention.

'Worldwide Rejection' of Invasion

PY2912152489 Moscow in Spanish to Cuba 0130 GMT 28 Dec 89

[Leonid Levchenko commentary]

[Text] Amid the outpouring of news on the worldwide rejection of the U.S. invasion of Panama, I was especially impressed by a demonstration staged in New York by representatives of U.S. society and Latin American youths studying in the United States. The demonstrators paraded with posters, one of which stated: Do not expect the United States to respect you because it underrates, underestimates, and does not care about the suffering of the Latin American people.

The poster speaks the truth. The U.S. aggression against a sovereign country is an inadmissible violation of international laws and UN statutes. The U.S. Government could not silence the international indignation through any subterfuge or explanation aimed at justifying the invasion.

This indignation was stronger among Latin American political sectors and society. Peruvian President Alan Garcia, for example, is insisting on urgently summoning the Latin American foreign ministers to examine the presence of U.S. troops in Panama. The Colombian and Venezuelan foreign ministers are currently holding consultations to debate the possibility of holding one more meeting at the OAS. We must remember that the OAS permanent council, at its 22 December meeting, expressed deep concern over the U.S. military intervention in Panamanian affairs and demanded that U.S. troops immediately leave the country. The U.S. representative to the OAS was the only delegate to vote against this resolution. The U.S. representative to the UN Security Council, supported by two other permanent members, succeeded in vetoing a resolution condemning Washington's military action. The fact that a special UN General Assembly has been summoned to discuss the Panamanian issue means that the U.S. Administration will have to face the community of all other nations.

It has already been announced at UN headquarters that a draft resolution prepared by a representative of the nonaligned countries will energetically condemn the U.S. military intervention and demand the immediate withdrawal of the occupation troops. This draft resolution classifies the U.S. action as a blunt violation of international laws on independence, sovereignty, and the territorial integrity of states. The document comments on the great concern over the U.S. military intervention and the presence of a large number of foreign troops that are endangering Central American peace and security and creating new obstacles to the peace process in this region.

A news conference with Soviet and foreign reporters was held in Moscow in which a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman praised the Nonaligned Movement's position on Panama, a member of the movement. He said he fully agrees with the position of the nonaligned countries regarding the U.S. military intervention. He also condemned the U.S. troops' actions against the Soviet Embassy in Panama.

Soviet UN Envoy Condemns U.S.

LD3012120189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 30 Dec 89

[Text] The UN General Assembly expressed deep regret in connection with the U.S. intervention in Panama and demanded that U.S. troops be withdrawn from there. In the resolution adopted, the U.S. actions are considered a flagrant violation of international law, and of the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of that state. The General Assembly decision is not binding, but reflects the position of the world community. The Soviet delegate called the U.S. intervention an act of blatant international terrorism.

UNGA Demands U.S. Withdrawal

LD3012141989 Moscow TASS in English 1348 GMT 30 Dec 89

[Text] New York December 30 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Mikhail Kochetkov:

The U.N. General Assembly [UNGA] on Friday demanded an immediate end to the U.S. intervention in Panama and the withdrawal of U.S. troops from that country. The 44th session of the U.N. General Assembly voted overwhelmingly for a resolution which described the U.S. intervention as "a flagrant violation of international law and of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of states."

It also demanded strict compliance with the letter and spirit of the Panama Canal Treaties and urged all states to respect Panama's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity.

The General Assembly took note of Panama's sovereign and inalienable right to freely determine its social, economic and political system and stressed the need to restore conditions guaranteeing the full observance of human rights and the basic freedoms of Panamanian people. The resolution expresses grave concern over the serious consequences, which the U.S. armed invasion of Panama can have for peace and security in Central America.

The resolution was passed by 75 votes, 40 countries abstained and 20 delegates voted against, including the United States, Britain, France and some other Western countries which said the resolution was unbalanced.

Many representatives of the international community condemned the U.S. actions and said they openly infringed on the main principles of the U.N. Charter. They included the representatives of Cuba, China, Ghana, Iran, Vietnam, Mexico, and some other countries. A Tanzanian representative said the U.S. invasion of Panama had serious consequences for the region and all small countries. He condemned the veto right used in the Security Council to justify the strong-arm tactics and gunboat diplomacy.

The U.S. delegate repeated Washington's well-known position on that issue and referred to Article 51 of the U.N. Charter concerning the right to self-defence.

The thesis that the U.S. Armed Forces exercised the inalienable right to self-defence in Panama does not stand up to criticism, said Soviet Delegate Aleksandr Belonogov. These claims have been dismissed, with good reason, as inconclusive by government statements of dozens of countries, he said. "By speaking at the United Nations we are not trying to pursue the aim of whitewashing or justifying the policy and practice of General Noriega. We have raised our voice of protest out of deep conviction that the U.N. Charter, the principles of non-use of force and non-interference in the internal affairs of other states should be unbreakable, while their observance by other states should be unswerving," he said.

"In this connection the question of who becomes the next target of the use of force is far from being a rhetoric one. Where is the guarantee that the United States would not use as 'arguments' aviation, tanks, artillery and paratroopers under a far-fetched pretext?" the Soviet delegate said.

He also urged the United States to renounce the strong-arm methods and strictly abide by the principles of the U.N. Charter.

Servicemen 'Behaving Like Highwaymen'

PY3012190289 Moscow in Portuguese to Brazil 2200 GMT 28 Dec 89

[Viktor Deruga commentary]

[Text] International analysts are seriously studying the fatal consequences that the U.S. military invasion of Panama could have for the peace process in Central America. This is the subject discussed by Viktor Deruga:

There are really more than enough reasons for the Central American peace process to be seriously affected [passage indistinct] the recognition by the U.S. authorities which admit that the peace process in the region could deteriorate as a consequence of the aggression against Panama.

I do not understand the U.S. position, whether it is positive or negative, or if the United States said this with satisfaction or sorrow. However, some presidents have already revealed their intentions as can be observed by the recent violation of the Nicaraguan airspace by two foreign military aircraft and the seige on some diplomatic missions in Panama, like the Nicaraguan and Cuban Embassies.

Just imagine: The intervention forces behave as they please. U.S. soldiers arrest people on the streets; they block roads, raid houses, and frequently steal money and valuables. The champions of freedom are behaving like highwaymen.

By what can be observed, this military action which flagrantly violated international law, the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of a small state, displays another kind of morality. And this is the main danger: The irresponsible behavior of the United States has created an atmosphere of general distrust of that country, especially in Latin America, the region mainly affected by this aggression. Unfortunately this has just been one more U.S. aggression against another country of its same continent.

Without doubt, the arbitrary U.S. action will encourage extremist forces to revenge or emulate the U.S. behavior and to disregard the law. Thus, the unexpected and uncontrolled action of the U.S. Government obliges countries like Nicaragua to adopt preventive measures, since no one knows if the U.S. troops will again launch a new aggression during night or day.

This action does not contribute at all to restoring general political normality in Latin America. Two months before elections are held in Nicaragua, the Panamanian factor has brought up undesirable, uncertain, nervous elements, which in turn, could turn (?against) the United States.

A Venezuelan politician has said that besides the U.S. intervention in Panama with 30,000 soldiers and the failure to justify this insolent aggression, it would not

cost the United States anything to violate other norms, laws, and rules with absolute scorn for foreign sovereignty.

IZVESTIYA Updates Situation

PM0101112590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jan 90 Morning Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA PRESS SERVICE report: "Panama—Tension Persists"]

[Text] According to news agencies, the tense situation in Panama persists. The contingent of U.S. troops which has surrounded the Vatican mission where General Noriega has taken refuge is growing all the time. Tanks have been deployed on the adjoining streets. The Americans have tightened their control, vehicles are being searched. The blockade of the Nicaraguan and Cuban embassies is continuing. In a statement distributed here Panama's Episcopalian Conference notes that Noriega's continued stay in the Vatican mission is creating a dangerous seat of tension. The country's Catholic Church is calling for Noriega to be handed over to the Panamanian authorities.

A. Maduro, chairman of the chamber of trade, industry, and agriculture, has stated that direct damage caused by the U.S. armed aggression has totaled $2 billion. In his opinion, if Panama does not receive aid of around $1 billion in the next few months there can be no talk of the country's economic recovery.

As reported by REUTER's correspondent, President G. Bush held a short meeting with journalists in Houston (Texas). Replying to a question on events in Panama, he emphasized: "We shouldn't have gone into the Nicaraguan mission. We have expressed our regret."

The President touched on the issue of negotiations with the Vatican regarding the fate of Gen Noriega, who has taken refuge in the mission of the papal nuncio in Panama. He said that the United States maintains "good, close ties" with the Vatican but that there is at the same time "a certain tension." If need be he is prepared to call the pope to discuss the situation that has come about.

On the same day the U.S. State Department issued a statement which looks like an attempt to justify the entry of U.S. troops into the residence of the Nicaraguan envoy in Panama. When it was ascertained, the statement says, that this house was the residence of the Nicaraguan diplomat, "the weapons were returned," and the Sandinista government's assertion that Nicaraguans were treated improperly during the search is inaccurate. Film shown in a CNN report from Panama hardly corroborates the State Department spokesman: The cameraman filmed a ransacked room, an emptied filing cabinet, and things strewn over the floor.

"As we begin to add up our losses and our soldiers come home in coffins draped in the Stars and Stripes, the intervention in Panama is turning into agony," Jesse Jackson, the well-known U.S. political and public figure, has said in San Francisco. The moral losses of the United States are enormous, he emphasized. Most countries in the world, including the allies of the United States, have condemned the intervention as a violation of international law and national sovereignty.

U.S. Troops Occupy Nicaragua's Panama Embassy

LD3012104589 Moscow TASS in English 1020 GMT 30 Dec 89

[Text] Panama City December 30 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Eldar Abdullayev:

At approximately 18.00, local time, on December 29 an armed group of U.S. soldiers, supported by tanks and armoured personnel carriers, encircled the residence of the Nicaraguan ambassador to Panama and through loudspeakers demanded that all the occupants immediately abandon the residence compound.

The soldiers delivered an ultimatum that U.S. units would enter the residence if the demand is not complied with for two hours.

At 20.00 U.S. soldiers broke down the gate of the residence of the Nicaraguan ambassador and occupied the building, firing several shots into the air.

Then they summoned all staff of the Nicaraguan Embassy and members of their families and rudely pushed them out into the street.

At present the Nicaraguan ambassador is under detention and is near the residence surrounded by U.S. officers and men. The residence is still occupied by U.S. soldiers.

They have been no official reprots from the U.S. Southern Command. At the same time the realiability of this information was confirmed in a TASS interview by one of staff members of the Nicaraguan Embassy in Panama. There is no information as to whether there were political refugees within the compound of the Nicaraguan ambassador's residence.

Nicaraguan Statement on Evacuation from Panama

LD3012105189 Moscow TASS in English 1022 GMT 30 Dec 89

[Text] Managua December 30 TASS—The Nicaraguan Foreign Ministry circulated a communique here on Friday, emphasizing that the Republic's government decided against ordering Nicaraguan civilian aircraft, blockaded in Panama by U.S. troops, to leave Panama until the occupation authorities allow the aircraft to evacuate more than 100 Nicaraguan citizens.

The document points out that a permission for the Boeing-707 and An-32 planes of the Aeronica Company to leave without passengers was received from the states on December 28.

The Nicaraguan Foreign Ministry seeks a permission for the planes to evacuate more than 100 Nicaraguans who found themselves in Panama and who have been unable to return home for more than a week now.

In the face of this "discriminatory stance of the interventionist troops in Panama", the Nicaraguan Government will continue to use retaliatory measures that were announced on December 26, the Nicaraguan Foreign Ministry stated.

In accordance with the measures, a U.S. cargo aircraft which delivers food for the U.S. Embassy in Managua every month, was temporarily denied the right to make a flight and land within the Republic's territory.

As a result of efforts made, about 50 Nicaraguans from among those in Panama were sent to Nicaragua by land on Thursday, the document reported.

'Foreign Aircraft' Violate Nicaraguan Air Space

LD3012105389 Moscow TASS in English 1023 GMT 30 Dec 89

[Text] Managua December 30 TASS—By TASS correspondent Igor Pshenichnikov:

Foreign aircraft without identification marks again several times intruded into Nicaraguan air space in recent days, making provocative flights over vast areas of the Republic.

Late in the evening of December 27, an unidentified jet aircraft entered Nicaragua's air space in the southern department of Rivas, the Nicaraguan Defence Ministry reported on Friday.

On December 28 another foreign aircraft made a high-speed flight over Managua Department.

On the same day yet another aircraft intruded into Nicaragua's air space in the area of Chinandega Department and made a flight over national territory from the northern border to the capital.

In all the three instances Nicaraguan Air Defence gunners opened anti-aircraft barrage fire and forced the intruders to withdraw.

Last Tuesday two foreign aircrart without identification marks were reported to have tried to approach practically simultaneously and at a high speed the capital's Augusto Cesar Sandino International Airport.

As a result of resolute actions of Nicaraguan Air Defence gunners, the planes had to leave Nicaragua's air space.

The command of the Sandinista People's Army supposes that the intruder planes may belong to El Salvador, Honduras or the United States.

Ortega on Near 'Fatal Conflict' With U.S.

LD0101211290 Moscow TASS in English 1910 GMT 1 Jan 90

[Text] Managua January 1 TASS—By TASS correspondent Igor Pshenichnikov:

"Nicaragua and the United States were on the verge of a fatal conflict" on December 29 when U.S. military broke into the residence of the Nicaraguan ambassador to Panama, President Daniel Ortega of Nicaragua told journalists on Sunday. He noted that on December 29 relations between the two states went through the past decade's most critical moment.

The president described the sending of 20 U.S. Embassy officials out of Nicaragua as a "very moderate response" to the act of provocation by the U.S. occupation force in Panama.

The United States counted on the Sandinista government to respond in kind and thus supply Washington with a pretext for direct armed intervention in the republic.

Responding to questions from TASS, Ortega made it clear that the Nicaraguan authorities had no intention to use tougher measures of repression against the U.S. Embassy in Managua. At the same time, the statement by President Bush that the U.S. troops should not have invaded the Nicaraguan ambassador's residence in Panama did not absolve the United States of the responsibility for provoking an explosive situation, the Nicaraguan leader stressed.

We hope, Ortega said, that the United States will pull out its troops from Panama. As long as U.S. troops are in that country Washington cannot be trusted. If the United States strive to win the trust of Latin American countries and the world community as a whole, it is obliged to withdraw its troops from Panama.

Otherwise, a threat to stability on the Latin American continent is created. The Sandinista People's Army will be on high alert until the U.S. troops leave Panamanian territory, Ortega said.

Cuba Marks Revolution's Anniversary 1 Jan

LD0101143990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 1 Jan 90

[Correspondent Viktor Gorbachev report from Havana]

[Text] In Cuba 1 January is called Liberation Day. On that day in 1959 the pro-U.S. dictatorship fell. The revolutionary war which had lasted for more than 2 years ended in the victory of the people. A historic choice was made. Over the past 3 decades the Cubans have achieved impressive successes and won a considerable number of major victories. At the same time, the small, backward country which began building socialism in the immediate vicinity of the most powerful imperialist power has more than once found itself in a difficult position. The

Cubans are marking this anniversary of the revolution, too, in a complex situation. The situation in the region has once again become acute because of the recent U.S. invasion of Panama. In the mid-eighties the rapid development of the economy was replaced by decline, and great efforts are now required to overcome the difficulties and restore the growth rates. Last year was a year of consolidation of the new economic and social plans. Among these, the main attention is being paid to the food program. New forms of labor organization have been developed.

The difficult tasks which have to be accomplished were discussed at the session of the National Assembly of People's Power which was held in the days running up to the holiday. Pantallon Rodriguez, a deputy in the Assembly from Villa Clara Province replied to my question about what the moral state of the Cuban people is now that the country's economy is going through perhaps the most complex period since the victory of the revolution.

Our people's moral spirit and political awareness have never been at such a high level as they are today, Pantallon Rodriguez said. Our people have always displayed such qualities when they have come up against difficulties, problems, and dangers. That was how it was when the interventionists landed at Playa Giron in April 1961. That was how it was during the Caribbean crisis which broke out the following year. Every Cuban is aware of his duty and ready to fulfill it.

Soviet Leadership Greets Castro

PM0101171390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jan 90 Second Edition p 5

[Soviet leadership organs greet Cuba's Fidel Castro on National Day]

[Text] To Comrade Fidel Castro Ruz, first secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee and president of Cuba's Councils of State and Ministers

Dear Comrade Fidel Castro!

We cordially congratulate you, the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee, Cuba's Councils of State and Ministers, and the fraternal Cuban people on their national holiday—Liberation Day!

We value highly the relations of friendship and all-around cooperation that have evolved between the Soviet Union and Cuba and which were consolidated in the treaty of April 1989. We will continue to do everything possible to further strengthen and develop collaboration between the Soviet and Cuban peoples in all spheres of life.

Cuba's recent election to the UN Security Council confirms its authority in the international arena. The world has worthily appraised Cuba's substantial contribution to the solution of the problems in southern Africa. We are confident that your country will continue—on the basis of a realistic approach to contemporary processes—to play an active role in strengthening peace and security, in the disarmament process, and in resolving regional conflicts, and that it will continue to defend the principles of noninterference and respect for peoples' right to freely choose the direction of their development.

We wish you and all the people of the Republic of Cuba new successes in socialist building, peace, happiness, and prosperity in 1990.

[Signed] CPSU Central Committee
USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
USSR Council of Ministers

Yazov Greets Raul Castro

PM0101141390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Jan 90 First Edition p 1

["USSR Defense Minister Greets Cuban Armed Forces Minister"]

[Text] To Comrade Army General Raul Castro Ruz, minister of Cuba's Revolutionary Armed Forces

Esteemed Comrade Minister!

On behalf of the USSR Armed Forces and on my own personal behalf I congratulate you and all personnel of Cuba's Revolutionary Armed Forces on Liberation Day.

Soviet people are well acquainted with the history of the revolutionary struggle of the Cuban people, who have succeeded in upholding their independence and their right to live according to their own choice.

We note with satisfaction that Soviet-Cuban ties and the cooperation between our peoples and armies, based on the principles of equality and respect for autonomy, possess a stable character.

On the day of your national holiday I wish all personnel of the Revolutionary Armed Forces new successes in improving their combat skill and ensuring the reliable defense of the Cuban people's revolutionary gains.

[Signed] Army General D. Yazov, USSR minister of defense

Diplomat Gives TV Address

LD0101200290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 1 Jan 90

[Address by Rafael Mirabal Fernandez, Cuban charge d'affaires in the USSR, on 1 January in Moscow TV studio—from the "Vremya" newscast; live or recorded]

[Text] Esteemed friends, today, the 31st anniversary of the Cuban revolution, we are inspired ever more urgently to future achievements in the cause of building socialism in Cuba by the lofty ideals and principles, for which tens of thousands of our compatriots gave their lives. Since January 1959, U.S. imperialism has been compelled to face the reality of the existence in Latin

America of a revolutionary government, accepted by the people, which took upon itself all responsibility and adopted a decision to proclaim socialism just 90 miles from its powerful neighbor.

Thanks to socialism, which guarantees us national independence, profound economic and social changes, which are manifested in the undoubted successes in health, education, and social security, have been achieved despite the senseless and arrogant policy of the United States Government, which continues its illegal economic blockade of Cuba and the occupation of part of our territory as its own naval base.

The recent decision to begin illegal transmission of television broadcasts directed at our territory in violation of sovereignty and international norms is yet another example of the pernicious policy of the United States.

On the threshold of the third millenium, despite the efforts of the international community to establish relations of peace and cooperation on the planet, which are inseparably linked with solving the problem of development, the United States is persistently continuing to pursue in Latin America and other regions of the world its policy of force.

Dear comrades, I would like to assure you that Cuba will continue to remain loyal to the ideals which inspired its revolution and the friendship which has linked it with Lenin's homeland.

I wish you a happy New Year and wish you success in tackling the historic tasks which face the Soviet people. Thank you very much.

Castro's Criticism of U.S. Policy Cited

PM0101160990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Jan 90 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Cuba—F. Castro Speech"]

[Text] Cuba celebrates the 31st anniversary of its revolution on the 1st day of 1990. The Republic's people are entering the new year fully prepared to improve socialism. The basic programs of the country's socioeconomic development are being successfully fulfilled.

This, in particular, was pointed out by Cuban leader Fidel Castro when he spoke at the opening in Havana of some new clinics.

Summing up the results of 1989, in conversation with journalists he singled out among the most important events the start of the implementation of the tripartite agreements on a settlement in South-West Africa and the return home of the Cuban internationalist soldiers.

Concerning the international situation, Castro emphasized that the enemies of free Cuba cannot reconcile themselves to the fact of the existence alongside them of a socialist state pursuing an independent policy. The U.S. Administration has recently mounted a propaganda campaign, accusing Cuba of human rights violations; however, these fabrications were convincingly refuted at a session of the UN Human Rights Commission held in Geneva this year.

Washington has no intention of abandoning the policy of force in relations with the developing countries. Proof of the U.S. Administration's imperial sentiments is the intention to begin relaying the transmissions of a subversive anti-Cuban television station, which is an overt violation of sovereignty and interference in the Republic's internal affairs, Castro pointed out.

Congress of People's Deputies

Gorbachev Urges Reflection on Tbilisi Events

PM2912163789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Unattributed account: "On Events in Tbilisi"]

[Excerpts] On 24 December 1989, the Second Congress of People's Deputies heard the report of the commission set up by the first Congress of USSR People's Deputies to investigate the events which took place in Tbilisi 9 April 1989.

In accordance with a resolution that was adopted, we publish the text of the statement for the press on the results of the investigation of the Tbilisi events. [passage omitted]

M.S. Gorbachev wound up the debate:

M.S. Gorbachev said, "The Tbilisi events are a painful experience, which we all share. We deeply feel the tragedy of these events and we express sympathy to the Georgian people in connection with what happened, which entailed unjustified loss of human life, death and destruction. I believe that this is something on which we all agree.

"However, I would like to say something else. I am one of those who were in favor of not launching into a debate on these events, of asking the commission to draw up a well-weighed report, of thinking more about the lessons to be learned from this, about what should be done in order to prevent events of this kind from ever recurring.

"We have embarked on a path of profound changes, of interpreting our entire history and our present, of reflecting on our future. This is a difficult process, the future is connected with the renewal of our society which we must fashion with our hands, our minds, and our hearts. There is no other way, friends. There is no other option! This is the greatest characteristic feature of our country, where so many peoples have lived, united, for centuries—the joint history of our peoples goes back far beyond the confines of the present century. And we are bound to be successful in everything if we stick to our choice and to the friendship and cooperation among all the peoples of our country.

"Alarming things can now be found in every republic. We can find phenomena which we cannot condone. However, there is one thing we must always remember: This does not mean that we should, on this basis, judge peoples and their stances and call into question everything that has taken shape over centuries and that united us into a great and harmonious family—a family which has passed through difficult trials and which is capable of great achievements in the interests of both its own country and the whole of human civilization.

"Therefore, I believe, the deputies from Georgia (I talked to them during the break, and we conducted that conversation as it should be conducted—openly and directly) should not suspect the other peoples of harboring disrespect, doubt, or even distrust toward the Georgian people, either in this auditorium or across the country. I ask you to support my statement."

Deputies Assail Interregional Group Statement

PM0201090190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[Yu. Nikolayev article: "Opposition Posture. Collective Assessment of Statement in Name of Interregional Group"]

[Text] The 22 December evening session of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies ended in an unexpected fashion. After the completion of its work had been announced and deputies were beginning to rise from their seats, Academician Zh.I. Alferov suddenly mounted the rostrum and expressed a resolute protest at the fact that the "Interregional Group statement" delivered the day before by Yu.N. Afanasyev, rector of the Moscow State Historical Archives Institute, bore his, Alferov's, signature among others. He added:

"So far as I am aware, this 'document' was not actually signed by many other comrades whose names appear on the list distributed to deputies."

Even before that, during a recess, I had been told the same thing by another deputy, M.N. Poltoranin—an active member of the Interregional Group, incidentally. He, too, expressed surprise that his name featured on the list of "oppositionists."

So then, like it or not, I had to take another look at the transcript of the Congress for 21 December, at the statement itself. It begins as follows, and I quote: "Esteemed Comrade Deputies!" Yu.N. Afanasyev said. "I have been empowered to convey to the Congress a statement that as of this moment has been signed by 140 USSR people's deputies—members of the Interregional Group of Deputies. I say as of this moment because not everyone who expressed a wish to sign it has yet done so. They will do so later. In addition, the Baltic group of people's deputies also associates itself with this statement. Thus in this statement I will be expressing the position of at least 250 USSR deputies...."

Quite impressive, you must admit—the position of 250 deputies! The only thing that puts you on your guard is the cunning evasions: "not everyone has done so," "will associate itself [future tense as published]...." At the congress secretariat I tried to find out how many supporters this duly "empowered" agent actually has.... The secretariat turned out to have no lists of either 140 or 250 deputies. I was told to wait till the next day for "amplified lists."

At a meeting with deputies I expressed my perplexity.

"I was at the Interregional Group session at which an attempt was made to have at least some sort of discussion of the text of the statement," labor veteran Deputy I.S. Lyzo remarked crossly. "Nothing like that took place at all!"

V.I. Yarovoy, a deputy from Estonia and director of the "Dvigatel" Association, joined in the conversation:

"And how could those lists have existed when even today Yuriy Nikolayevich Afanasyev was doing his utmost to persuade people to associate themselves with his statement. I myself witnessed his degrading, shameful haggling—there's no other word for it—with the Estonian deputies. Actually during the sitting he came up to our delegation and began to try to talk us into supporting his statement in exchange for support for the Estonians' position on questions regarding the Law on Constitutional Oversight. Apparently on the principle that: You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours.... This whole thing is shameful."

What is the fuss all about, what is the thrust of the statement? Clearly, there is no need to reproduce it in its entirety here. Full texts of the speeches have been reproduced on television, on radio, and in IZVESTIYA. We will confine ourselves to just a few points to which people's deputies drew attention in conversation. Although, I must admit, many of my interlocutors winced as though they had toothache as soon as talk turned to the "opposition." Nevertheless....

By no means every one of us has learned to perceive behind even the most radical (to use the currently fashionable terminology) phrase common or garden posturing and an unfounded claim to leadership and to some kind of ultimate truth. However, the number of people whose eyes are being opened is growing swiftly. For instance, V.A. Yarin, a worker from the Urals, described both the deliverer of the statement and the statement itself as by no means harmless "political childishness."

"I myself, like many others, joined the Interregional Group with an open heart," he recounted. "And I even spoke at one of its first sittings. But then increasingly often I began to see: Some kind of political game, behind-the-scenes intrigues, and a power struggle are going on behind our backs. But the most terrible discovery came only later. The group's leaders only pay lipservice to smashing the administrative edict system—in their dreams they see themselves issuing administrative edicts. I used to be forced to listen to Khrushchev's or Brezhnev's every word and was oppressed with the authority of their posts. Here the leaders of the Interregional Group have begun to oppress me in precisely the same way: Do this, and nothing else. But I want to be independent and to have my own opinion and position. The only thing I am seeking is respect for opinions. Via this respect we must take from one another something useful for the people. Unfortunately, in the Interregional Group I see no basis for such activity. Afanasyev's statement is further confirmation of that."

I reminded Veniamin Aleksandrovich that he himself is one of the leaders of a similar group, to be precise the "Russia" deputies' group, and Yarin flared up:

"We opened the 'Russia' club for contact, for direct discussion with voters, not for a game. I think that the club has great prospects. I once attended a sitting of the Interregional Group and a meeting of Russian deputies on the same day. Can they be compared? Whereas at the former the atmosphere was strenuously inflamed with rabble-rousing irresponsibility, everything was quite different at the latter. The Russian deputies had an interested discussion with scientists, political scientists, and writers about the sorest spots in our life. No one was trying to put himself on a pedestal or to gain power...."

As we can see, the worker deputy overall does not accept either the position that was set out or the methods by which it was formed. His only regret, it was easy to see from our conversation, is that the Interregional Group contains "many wonderful guys who have not yet learned to oppose the blatant pressure from certain silver-tongued leaders." I heard similar remarks from other interlocutors, too. We also tried to analyze the theses of the "statement."

"We are against decreeing the CPSU's leading role, that is, the party's monopoly of power.... We are against the direct and open interference by the party apparatus, the Politburo, and the CPSU Central Committee in state, economic, and other spheres of society that ought to be subject solely to the competence of the soviets and to be regulated by the law alone." That is from the statement. That is precisely what it says.

"I simply could not keep my seat when I heard the pushy statement from the emerging opposition," Deputy G.I. Yanayev said. "I am prepared to reaffirm what I said from the rostrum. It is common knowledge that the party was the initiator of perestroyka.

"Perestroyka is taken as the starting point in the statement. But what is meant by this concept is manifestly destructive actions directed against the people, society, and the system. The term 'perestroyka' on some lips and in some declarations is a synonym for total license, dissolution, anti-Sovietism, anarchy, and total denigration. Another annoying thing about the statement is yet another attempt to sort the people's deputies into factions: Themselves on the left, others in the center and on the right. And this is downright blasphemy: While speaking as the 'independent opposition,' the authors unambiguously threatened that they are prepared to resort to extreme actions.... What is this—an ultimatum to the party that began perestroyka? An ultimatum to our Congress?

"In my view, the most important thing about the statement is the desire at all costs to establish the need for a policy of 'the worse, the better.'

"While criticizing the government program for improving the health of the economy as tardy and halfhearted, the authors of the document already foresee negative consequences of the proposed transition to market relations with regard to the living standards of the population, especially low-income strata. Note that the period when these consequences will obtain is defined very approximately—'at first.' Yet it is a question of the fate of 40 million low-income people.

"You get the impression that the document's authors are suffering from political daltonism, and in their rare moments of clear vision black is the predominant color. I would quote Dostoyevskiy once again: What we need is self-respect, not self-humiliation...."

Of late we have seen and heard more than enough of various advocates of fat purses. Of those who are trying by hook or by crook to adopt as rapidly as possible laws that would give a free hand to homegrown undercover fat cats and foreign fat cats to acquire plants and factories, land and mineral resources. Strange though it may seem, our people's elected representatives include some who would like, under cover of a clamor of debate, behind the back of the people themselves, and without thorough consultation with them, to formalize as rapidly as possible by dint of repetition laws on ownership, on land, and on rights to dispose of mineral resources and all our national wealth. The "interregionals' manifesto" also included hints of this, although they were camouflaged with seemingly reasonable arguments.

For instance, what objection could you make to the following premise: "We are opposed to the statized economy and do not think it is possible to stop the collapse of the national economy merely by means of administrative bans and edicts...." But has anyone at the Congress asserted the reverse to any extent at all? And here is what is meant by "destatization" of the economy.

"I am emphatically opposed to statization of the economy," I.S. Seleznev, leader of the "Raduga" machine building design office, asserted. "But I am also opposed to private ownership. Especially when you consider that we have learned to tap around 10 percent or even less of the real potential of collective ownership. We ought to be steering a course toward collective ownership. Laws, however correct, are obviously not enough here. A reliable mechanism for their implementation is needed.

"What is collective ownership? What is it like? I think that our interest in enterprise collectives has yet to be revealed and clearly manifested in this vein. But in the economic sphere the state in general should adopt a simple method—that is, obtain revenue via taxes, this will completely dismantle the administrative edict system. The state should participate in management via taxes on enterprise profits, give the collective total autonomy in maximizing those profits, and give them a high degree of interest."

I had a long discussion with Igor Sergeyevich and, to put it in a nutshell, whether you like it or not you must come to the conclusion: He has an extremely critical interpretation of the economic survey and prospects offered at the Congress. But he warns:

"Mind you, don't rank me among the oppositionists. I am merely considering for the future how best to structure the analytical portion of reports so that all the points are clear and intelligible both to deputies and to all Soviet people. I think the government has no more important task than this: How to make the best, the most effective use under the new conditions of the whole potential of the accumulated practical experience. No interregional group will do this, it imparts political overtones even to its interesting proposals and unfailingly tries to make some sort of dividends."

Yu.N. Afanasyev described as "extremely dangerous the 'attempt' to postpone the transition to a true market economy." But the day before, during our conversation with N.I. Ryzhkov, we heard a diametrically opposite assertion. It would be madness to plunge the country immediately into market chaos. At meetings with deputies I cited these two viewpoints. Obviously, I cannot claim to provide any exhaustively complete spectrum of opinions here, but I must say with the utmost responsibility that among my interlocutors there were no advocates of plunging headlong into unruly market forces. The deputies eagerly spoke of the need for a transition to a market economy, but only after looking before we leap, and looking not once but time after time. It takes no great intelligence to destroy all existing channels of production, commodity, and food supply. But it is first necessary to prepare their replacements and to create the appropriate preconditions. We have had enough of shooting from the hip...!

Nor was anyone fooled by the call to "immediately allow the peasants to choose themselves any forms of economic management, including free withdrawal from sovkhozes [state farms] and kolkhozes [collective farms] with their share of the land and property." Deputy S.A. Medvedev from Kazakhstan, who spoke after Afanasyev, reasonably remarked: Is anyone disputing the peasants' legitimate right to choose forms of economic management themselves? But before deciding the question for them, it would be worth consulting the peasants themselves.

At the end of the sitting a group of journalists besieged V.A. Starodubtsev. A well known person. By no criteria could you call him retrograde or a defender of the notorious administrative edict system. It was interesting to hear his opinion:

"We now rightly curse Stalin's forcible collectivization, but there is one thing I don't understand: Why are they now starting to dekulakize us all over again? Why are they trying to make things even worse than they were? The peasants must have the final say here. About how they should live, who should receive land, and who should work that land. If people are a long way from the land, they will bode ill for us. They will turn us into

slaves once again and force us to work for people other than ourselves. This can be decided only by the peasants, only with their consent, only by a referendum on a statewide scale...."

Vasiliy Aleksandrovich described an extremely noteworthy experiment in organizing individual farms in his association. Out of 600 potential candidates for farmer, 10 were chosen in a perfectly democratic fashion, by competition. As a starter they were each given R300,000-350,000 to purchase equipment and implements. They were given help in this. What was the result? Practice showed that only three or four of them run their farm more or less tolerably. The others merely drift along....

Anyone who has studied the interregionals' statement has obviously also noticed its comments on the nationalities topic.

"Rhetoric and slogans! What is indeed a complex problem should be approached more seriously and responsibly," Ukrainian poet B.I. Oleynik pithily sums up this part of the statement.

The aforementioned Deputy V.I. Yarovoy reaffirmed:

"From the Congress rostrum I spoke of the overly superficial view of the federal structure offered by Afanasyev. This is nothing more than dilettantism. I even told Yuriy Nikolayevich to spend just a year with us in Estonia so he can get a feel for not only the acuteness of the nationalities issue but also the humiliating nature of the status in which we 'migrants' find ourselves."

I would like to conclude this "deputies' assessment" with a fragment from an interview with a scientist who has seen plenty in his time. I asked him to assess the Congress debates and the political culture of the deputies who took part in the debate.

"You mean assess them according to the [ten-grade] school system?"

"Fine!"

"I'd put the deputies who have undergone schooling in the Supreme Soviet in fifth grade and those who haven't in second grade.... What? My grades are too low? Well, democracy is a difficult science. Moreover, it's appropriate to remark here that even the first-graders at the Congress must grasp the fundamentals of political competence and get a clear idea of the repercussions of what they say from so lofty a rostrum. That is at the very least!"

I did not take issue with the scientist....

Correction to Ligachev Talk on Corruption

LD2412134489

The following correction pertains to the item entitled "Ligachev Rejects Corruption Claims" published on page 47 of the 28 September DAILY REPORT:

Page 49, column one, paragraph two, from sentence two should read: ...in real life. I think, comrades, that it is precisely for this reason that some of our people believed the investigator's slanderous declarations in relation to workers of the Central Committee apparatus, about whose honesty and disinterestedness—I should like to stress—there are no doubts from my point of view. I would also... (rewording for clarity).

Political & Social

Gorbachev's Addresses Nation on New Year's Eve

PM0101151990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jan 90 Second Edition p 1

["New Year's Address to the Soviet People From M.S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet."]

[Text] Dear comrades,

The last minutes of 1989 are expiring and together with them a whole decade is going down in history. We are entering the 1990s, the last decade of the 20th century.

In such minutes we as if relive everything that happened to us and look forward to the future with hope. Everyone who feels and thinks as a citizen does not separate one's destiny from the destiny of the native land.

Whatever the aspect—joyous or bitter—the times turn to us and our kith and kin, every person shoulders part of what the entire country is experiencing.

The country has lived through a special year, I would say, the most difficult year of perestroika launched in the April of 1985. This has been a difficult year because we encountered a number of most acute problems.

The economic reform is proceeding with great tension and is making heavy weather and the situation on the consumer market has become aggravated.

We for the first time experienced mass industrial stoppages and heavy economic distruptions connected with them. There was a lack of order and discipline. Anxiety, caused by the exacerbation of inter-ethnic relations, has been with us throughout the year.

The outgoing year was difficult also because we got down directly to tackling new, unusual and large-scale tasks. All this required the greatest exertion of moral, spiritual and physical energies from all of us.

And still, however difficult the year 1989 was to us we are seeing it off not only with a sense of bitterness but also as a year of great work indispensable for all of us. The country lived and worked, restructuring itself and embarking upon a new road.

We have learned much over the past year. We had to reassess much and see many things quite differently now

than a year ago. We now more clearly visualise the goal that we strive to attain. This goal is a humane, democratic socialism, a society of freedom and social justice.

The past year has seen events of fundamental importance, the consequences of which have not yet been revealed to the full. The year 1989 became the year of genuinely free elections, the first ones in several decades of Soviet history;

The year of the First and Second Congress of the USSR People's Deputies;

The year of the gaining of parliamentary experience and a rapid rise in the democratic culture of the people.

Important legislative acts have been adopted and already work for the future. Bills concerning the restructuring of the basic principles of our society have been worked out and brought up for a nationwide discussion.

The year 1989 has been a year of intensive quest for effective measures to reduce socioeconomic strain in the country.

The Second Congress of People's Deputies endorsed a government programme which is designed to improve the situation on the consumer market, normalise the country's economy and bring about a transition towards a more efficient and flexible economy oriented towards people's needs.

There is one more thing. Notwithstanding all the complexities and political passions that 1989 has been notable for, there is growing awareness in society of the need for dialogue, mutual understanding, respect for various positions and a quest for mutually acceptable solutions.

I consider the recently concluded Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies also as one of manifestations of the constructive dialogue that has been established in the country.

Putting it in a nutshell, the outgoing year has seen the sowing of grains which, and one may have no doubt about it, will bring forth sprouts. It is not easy for the grains to grow in our soil. They are in need of constant care. But if they survive and strike root—and we must see to it—they will yield rich fruit for the entire country and for every person.

We can look into the future with hope. However great are the obstacles standing in our path and however much persistence they require, our country can cope with this task. It can and must rise full height and gain greater confidence in itself.

The outgoing year has become a year of major shifts in the international arena. New political thinking begins to yield fruit. In 1988 many regarded the idea of a common European home as a kind of utopia. At the turn of the year people already speak of it as a realistic prospect. The post-war division of the continent recedes into the past.

The past year became a year of the ending of the cold war. The 1990s bid fair to become the most fruitful period in the history of civilization. For this opportunity to be utilised, the world, just as we in the Soviet Union, needs solidarity, cooperation and accord.

The waves of revolutionary renewal have swept Eastern Europe. The necessity to combine socialism with democracy has again been vigorously reaffirmed in the dramatic events that occurred in Berlin, Sofia, Prague, and Bucharest. We wish our friends successes along this road. They can always rely on our solidarity.

Allow me on behalf of the Soviet people to convey the best wishes to all peoples for the incoming year and say that our people are ready to proceed together with them along the road of freedom and progress.

The incoming year 1990 is a year of great hopes and practical deeds in the revolutionary restructuring of socialism. In the new year we shall need determination and firmness in our revolutionary work to unite all pro-perestroyka forces.

Reason and kindness, patience and tolerance—the main human traits that, I am sure, are characteristic of every person—are vitally essential to us.

We possess truly unique opportunities: a wealth of intellectual and labour potential and huge natural resources. By utilizing them we can and must fundamentally change the situation for the better in 1990. With this end in view we all need to work quite a lot and conscientiously.

While addressing you, dear comrades, I have a mental image of millions of people of all nationalities inhabiting the Soviet Union —women, men, and children, people of various professions with their interests, inclinations, plans and hopes for the future—gathering now in front of their television sets awaiting the chimes of the Kremlin clock.

On the threshold of the New Year I would like to wish most of all that it passes under the watchword of mutual understanding and consolidation, which our society and all of us need so much.

Happy New Year, dear compatriots!

I wish you happiness, peace and well-being!

Violent Disturbances Reported in Azerbaijan

Interior Ministry Cited

LD0201152990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1432 GMT 2 Jan 90

[Text] Baku, 2 Jan (AZERINFORM-TASS)—The Azerbaijani papers today publish a report of the Internal Affairs Ministry of this Transcaucasian Soviet republic on the disturbances that have occurred during the last

few days in Dzahalilabadskiy rayon. The work of enterprises and offices has been paralyzed and roads have been blocked.

According to the Ministry of Internal Affairs, on the morning of 29 December a disorderly crowd, which had placed women and youths to the front, committed a pogrom in the buildings of the rayon militia department and rayon party committee. Talyat Kasumov, the republican health minister, who was on the spot at the time, reported that during the disturbances 22 members of the population received medical attention. Of these, 16 were sent home after receiving assistance and the other 6 were kept in the hospital. Sixty-three members of the militia, some of whom were also sent to the hospital, received bodily injuries.

As a result of the measures taken by the authorities, the republican Internal Affairs Ministry reports, the roads have now been cleared and the tents of those who took part in the meetings, and in which spirits and sharp and pointed instruments were discovered, have been dismantled. Thirty-seven people have been detained by the police.

An AZERINFORM correspondent who was at the scene has reported that the majority of the inhabitants of the rayon are demanding local elections be held there involving more than one candidate.

In this connection, a group of deputies of the Azerbaijani Supreme Soviet has flown urgently to the rayon.

The situation in Dzhalilabad, the republican Internal Affairs Ministry report says, has become stable but remains tense.

1 Killed, 100 Reported Hurt

AU3012205389 Paris AFP in English 1904 GMT 30 Dec 89

[Excerpt] Moscow, Dec 30 (AFP)—One person may have died and at least 100 others were injured in a protest Friday against the party leader in Dzhalal Abad in the Soviet republic of Azerbaijan, an Azeri nationalist spokesman said Saturday.

Leila Yunussova [name as received], spokesperson for the Azerbaijan Popular Front who was contacted by telephone from Moscow, said the militia had announced the figure of 100 over local television, and said 28 of these had been hospitalized. But "according to other sources, one person has reportedly died from the wounds, and there may be up to 150 injured", she said, though her group had not been able to confirm these figures.

The protestors were demanding the removal of the party first secretary in Dzhalal Abad, whom Mrs. Yunussova said took over a month-and-a-half ago. She confirmed reports by a Radio Moscow publication, INTERFAX, Friday [29 December] that they had set fire to the Communist Party headquarters in the city, and said they also set fire to the police department and about 15 police cars.

Mrs. Yunussova said the protest was called by Dzhalal Abad's local Popular Front, but criticized them as being "far from any notion of democracy and without any political experience." She charged that the protest was aimed at "using force to destabilize the situation in the republic." She said there was no nationalist issue involved since the "region is only peopled by Azeris and the first secretary himself comes from the republic."

She also said there was no repression by police, who "made arrests after the demonstration, but before, none". [passage omitted]

Tension Following Attack

NC3012104289 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 30 Dec 89

[From the republican press review]

[Text] Newspapers today report that a complicated situation has arisen in Dzhalal Abad Rayon because of the activities of antireconstruction elements. The situation has become tense. Misusing openness and democracy, these elements are violating laws intentionally. An armed extremist group headed by Bayramov, a physician at an emergency clinic, attacked buildings housing the rayon's party affairs committee and internal affairs department on the morning of 29 December. A number of people were injured and one was hit by a bullet.

A group of deputies from the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet and leading officials from the republic's law enforcement organs have traveled to Dzhalal Abad to normalize the situation, which is now being stabilized.

Situation Stabilized

NC3012191289 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 30 Dec 89

[Report from the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic Ministry of Internal Affairs]

[Text] A very (?negative) situation has recently emerged in Dzhalal Abad Rayon as a result of the obstruction of the normal activities of the local party, soviet, and law enforcement organs by the opponents of reconstruction. The work of the establishments and administrations have been disrupted and the transportation routes have been blocked. About 200 [words indistinct] have been stranded in the rayon. The opening of transportation routes has been possible through the measures that have been put into effect. The tents used for [word indistinct] have been increased and various types of drinks and [words indistinct] goods have been sold in them. A total of 37 individuals have been confined to administrative detention.

As reported earlier, the buildings of the rayon Internal Affairs Department and the rayon party committee were pillaged by a crowd of people who [words indistinct] on 29 December. According to Kasumov, minister of health, who is in Dzhalal Abad at the present time, 22 individuals had to be treated as a result of the disturbances. Sixteen of them were allowed to go home and the remaining six were hospitalized. Sixty-three militia workers suffered physical injuries. A number of them were hospitalized.

The situation in Dzhalal Abad has stabilized, but it remains tense.

New Dzhalal Abad Rayon Committee Chairman Elected

NC2712141789 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 24 Dec 89

[From Republican Press Review]

[Text] The plenum held by the Dzhalal Abad Rayon Party Committee [raykom] examined the question of organization. The plenum relieved (?Kodzhamanov) of his responsibilities as the first secretary of the raykom because he was appointed to another post. After a debate on the names of a number of the candidates for the job, Aliyev, who earlier worked as an instructor in the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Ideology Department, was elected by secret ballot as first secretary of the Dzhalal Abad Raykom.

Ratib Zeynalov, Secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, addressed the plenum. Yoldashova, Candidate Member of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and a brigade worker affiliated with the state farm named after Samed (?Vurgun), participated in the work of the plenum.

Azeris Demonstrate on Iranian Border

AU0201163290 Paris AFP in English 1544 GMT 2 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow, Jan 2 (AFP)—People from Soviet Azerbaijan have staged a nationalist demonstration on the border with Iran, nationalist and official sources contacted in Baku from here said Tuesday.

(The Iranian newspaper KEYHAN reported on Monday that Azeri demonstrators on Sunday burnt several Soviet frontier posts while calling for Moslem unity.)

An Azeri nationalist Mrs. Leyla Yunussova, and a correspondent of the Azerbaijan news agency AZERINFORM, Saveli Peres, said that an "action" occurred on Sunday [31 December] on the frontier between the Autonomous Republic of Nakhichevan, which forms part of Azerbaijan, and Iran.

But there were different versions of this "action". A spokesman for the Azeri Ministry for Foreign Affairs suggested that another telephone call be made "in several days' time" for details.

Mrs Yunussova, of the Azerbaijan Social Democratic Group, said that dissident nationalists of the Popular Front had called on Saturday, during a rally in Baku, for a symbolic "action" the following day at Nakhichevan "to burn the frontier" in protest at the separation of the Azeri people on either side of the frontier.

The call for such "action" was made by Nemat Panakhov, a representative of the "right wing" of the Azeri Popular Front. Hundreds of people burnt a wooden fence along the frontier with Iran, but no-one was arrested, she said.

She noted that the Popular Front had split early in December. The other branch of the movement had dissociated itself from the incident, and envisaged closer links with Iranian Azeris through the development of trade, cultural and other contacts.

Mr. Peres of AZERINFORM said that an "action" occurred on Sunday, but described the aim as being to occupy a "protective zone" lying unoccupied on the Soviet side adjacent to the Araks River on the border with Iran.

He said that more than 4,000 people were involved, and that the move was the decision of the people of Nakhichevan who were worried about the inflow of Azeri refugees from Armenia.

He said that "posts" marking the frontier were burnt during the incident.

Attack on Armenian Village in NKAO Reported

NC3012091989 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 29 Dec 89

[Text] According to reports from Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, NKAO], the days of tension are continuing. Extremist elements among the Azeri people try to launch attacks on Armenian villages. Such alarming reports are received every day from various regions of the oblast. The current alarm about the danger of an attack was raised by residents of Harav village in Askeranskiy Rayon. A group of Azeris from Vushchula village in Shushinskiy Rayon armed with different types of rifles and searchlights raided Harav and fired from the mulberry grove at houses on 27 December at around 2000. The Azeris then turned on searchlights directed at the village and took up combat positions. The Azeri chauvinists left after 1 ½ hours, after seeing that the villagers did not succumb to this blatant provocation.

The villagers said that these aggressive acts seek to terrorize the people and force them to abandon their native hearths. However, the Azeri bandits are grossly mistaken in their calculations. The people of Harav, just like the people of Artsakh, will never abandon their native land.

Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Session Begins 29 Dec

LD2912151789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 29 Dec 89

[Text] The session of the Supreme Soviet of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] began its work in Baku today. Deputies are to consider the state plan for the economic and social development of the republic to 1990, analyze the fulfilment of the plans in the current year, and discuss the state plan for the republic for the coming year and an account on the fulfilment of the budget for 1988. Those participating in the session will also discuss a series of draft laws for the Azerbaijan SSR and will consider other issues as well.

Discusses Disturbances

LD2912195289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 29 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet session got down to work in Baku today.

[Correspondent M. Mamedov] The plan for the economic and social development of the republic for 1990 was put forward for discussion by the deputies, as was the progress in its implementation. I would like to note the fundamentally new approaches toward tackling the economic and social problems of importance for Azerbaijan. Specific measures to stabilize the consumer market and to bolster the circulation of money were taken. One of the important thrusts of the new economic policy will be its social orientation.

The session took a recess for a few hours. The problem was that the situation has deteriorated in the Dzhalilabadskiy Rayon of Azerbaijan, where this morning a group of individuals attacked the party's rayon committee and the militia's rayon section. There were some casualties, and a group of deputies from the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet and the leaders of the republic's law enforcement bodies urgently left. Now the situation seems to be getting back to normal. Meanwhile, the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet session will continue with its work.

Further on Session

NC3012110789 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 30 Dec 89

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The times demand that the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] tackle a series of wide-ranging tasks. The measures being put into effect to ensure the republic's sovereignty and the preparations being made for work under conditions of economic independence and a system of regional economy have created wide-ranging opportunities for a radical restructuring in the economic field, as well as in the social and moral fields. This requires a high level of organization in all fields, a high sense of responsibility, and the consolidation of production and performance discipline in all ways.

The deputies debated the matters submitted to the 11th session of the 11th convocation of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet from this standpoint.

As reported earlier, the session convened in the meeting hall of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet on 29 December. The report on the meeting published by the newspapers notes that the session was opened by Deputy A. Kerimov, deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet. The session's agenda and work schedule were approved. Deputy Guseynov, deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR State Planning Committee, delivered a report on the state plan for the economic and social development of the Azerbaijan SSR in 1990 and the fulfillment of the 1989 plan for economic and social development. Deputy Karayev, Azerbaijan SSR minister of finance, delivered a report on the Azerbaijan SSR's state budget for 1990 and the realization of the republic's budget for 1988.

The Supreme Soviet heard additional reports by the permanent commissions. Ziyad Samed-zade, chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Plan and Budget Commission, also delivered a report. The reports were debated by the deputies and the Supreme Soviet then adopted decisions in connection with the approval of the state plan for 1990, the fulfillment of the state plan for 1989, the state budget for 1990, and the account of the realization of the state budget for 1988. The session then called for a recess.

The reports presented by Guseynov, deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Planning Committee, and Karayev, Azerbaijan SSR minister of finance, are published in today's newspapers.

Session Ends

LD3012163889 Moscow TASS in English 1631 GMT 30 Dec 89

[Text] Baku December 30 AZERINFORM-TASS—Ways to revitalise the economy of the republic are in the focus of the eleventh session of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet.

The state plan for 1990 sets out fundamentally new approaches in dealing with the backlog of problems in the economy and outlines measures aimed at stabilising the consumer market and strengthening money circulation. It is necessary to lay, already in the next year, the foundations for the republic's transition to self-financing and the acceleration of its economic development in the 13th five-year period.

Strengthening the social orientation of the economy is one of the major areas.

The problem of employment remains one of the most acute problems and a programme of creating additional jobs is called upon to ease tensions in this sphere.

The participants in the session passed the state plan for the economic and social development of Azerbaijan in 1990 and endorsed the republic's budget.

The session was adjourned in connection with the events in the Dzhalilabad region, where an extremist group attacked local party headquarters and the Interior Ministry Office. The situation in the region is being stabilised now.

Opening of Social Research Institute Reported

NC2912142989 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 22 Dec 89

[From Republican Press Review]

[Text] What awaits you in the future? How will progress in the social domain in the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] be upgraded? How can objectives in the economic and scientific fields be achieved as quickly as possible? A specific need has arisen in the present circumstances in the republic to unite the work carried out by the scientists and experts in various fields, in order to study the complex developments that have taken place in the republic in an objective and independent way and without [word indistinct] and to draw up development plans for various (?fields).

The Institute for Social Research and Programming, which has been established in accordance with a decision adopted by the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Bureau, will serve this purpose. The institute is an independent and creative organization of intellectuals that will carry out scientific research on the most important problems of Azerbaijan's development. The experience gained in the work of voluntary scientific associations was used in the establishment of the institute. The most significant of these associations is the non-official (?Roma) Club, of which prominent scientists and scholars are members.

A meeting was held at the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee on the occasion of the opening of the institute. Tel'man Orudzhev, secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, chaired the meeting. Ratib Aliyev, chief of the Ideology Department of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and corresponding member of the Azerbaijan SSR Academy of Sciences, addressed the convocation on the objectives and main tasks of the institute. Speeches were made. Ziyad Samed-zade, chief of the Social Economy Department of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, addressed the meeting on the need to maintain a systematic approach on the question of fulfilling economic tasks.

Gasan Gasanov, secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, participated in the convocation.

The newspapers published reports on the meeting.

Kirovabad City Renamed Gendzhe City

NC3012192689 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 30 Dec 89

[Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium decree on renaming Kirovabad City to Gendzhe City]

[Text] Taking into consideration the many appeals made by the city residents, the work collectives, and the masses in the republic, including the request by the Kirovabad City People's Deputies Soviet, for the restoration of Gendzhe's historic name, the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium, in accordance with Article 114, paragraph 8 of the Azerbaijan SSR Constitution, adopts the decision to rename Kirovabad City as Gendzhe City.

[Signed] Kafarova, chairwoman of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; and Kaziyeva, secretary of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.
[Dated] Baku City, 30 December 1989.

Azerbaijan Readopts Traditional Names

LD0201145390 Moscow TASS in English 1431 GMT 2 Jan 90

[Text] Baku January 2 TASS—By the decision of the Presidium of the Azerbaijani Supreme Soviet, the city of Kirovabad, a major industrial and cultural centre of Soviet Azerbaijan, has re-adopted its former name, Gandzha. Founded in the 5th century, the city bore the name of Kirovabad from 1935 until the beginning of the current year, commemorating Sergey M. Kirov, a Soviet statesman and party leader. Gandzha is the birth place of Nizami Gandzhevi, a classic of oriental poetry.

On the insistence of the Azerbaijani public, the Zhdanov region, named after Stalin's associate Andrey Zhdanov, has been rechristened the Beilagan region, after the city of Beilagan situated there in the past. Once it was a thriving medieval city famous for its handicrafts and architecture.

One of the central streets in Baku has been named after Babek, leader of an anti-feudal uprising in Azerbaijan in the 9th century. A public movement is rapidly developing to return historic names to cities and perpetuate of the names of national heroes.

Azerbaijan Automation Work 'Unsatisfactory'

NC2712161689 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 22 Dec 89

[From the republican press review]

[Text] Five scientific and technical complexes were created in the republic to concentrate on automation and [words indistinct] some 4 years ago. Scientific research establishments, laboratories, university departments, and planning, construction, and technological organizations were included within the complexes' structure. Pertinent ministries, main administrations, production establishments, and unions were to have participated in the work that was to have been carried out. However, it has not been possible to achieve the (?level) planned when the complexes were established.

Why are the work programs of the complexes not being realized? Participants in a meeting held at the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee by the party economic aktivs of the scientific and technical complex for automation were asked to respond to this question.

Ratib Zeynalov, secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, delivered the opening speech at the meeting. Ratib Aliyev, chief of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Ideology Department and corresponding member of the Azerbaijan Academy of Sciences, presented a report. The meeting heard various speeches and adopted a resolution describing the work being carried out by the scientific and technical complex for automation as unsatisfactory.

A detailed report on the meeting was published in the newspapers under the heading "The Management Mechanism Must Be Improved."

Bakatin on Case Against Armenian Deputy

NC2712152889 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 26 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 26 Dec (ARMENPRES)—Aleksandr Sukharev, USSR procurator general, and Vadim Bakatin, USSR minister of internal affairs, addressed a news conference for Soviet and foreign reporters accredited to the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies which was held in Moscow today.

Replying to a question about the case against Armenian Supreme Soviet Deputy A.M. Manucharov, the procurator general (?said) that the USSR Procuracy has completed its investigation into the case and has referred it to a court for trial.

The Soviet and foreign reporters were also interested with the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. However, both the procurator general and the minister of internal affairs refrained from commenting on that issue, arguing that the NKAO problem will soon be debated in the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Deputies Urge Supreme Soviet Debate on NKAO

NC2912165789 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 28 Dec 89

[Report by ARMENPRES correspondent Ch. Balagyozyan: "The Problem of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast Will Be Heard"]

[Text] Moscow, 28 Dec (ARMENPRES)—On the eve of the ending of the deliberations of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the Armenian and Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] people's deputies suggested to Mikhail Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, that the debate on the NKAO be shifted to the upcoming session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Commenting to our correspondent on this request made at the congress, USSR People's Deputy Zori Balayan said:

[Balayan] The Armenian delegation at the congress can feel satisfied. The Supreme Soviet saw fit once again to take up the NKAO problem, despite the fact that the latest examination of this issue had been made not long before. We did not harbor any delusions; we expected no miracles from this session. That miracle took place back on 20 February 1988, when the oblast soviet session passed its historic decision. Here, at the congress, we were aiming to draw the attention of each people's deputy to the NKAO drama, Sumgait tragedy, and the past and present picture and future prospects of that segment of the Armenian people.

However, as the congress deliberations drew to a close—after which the special session of the Supreme Soviet was to be held—the situation changed radically. The congress was extended for a further 2 days and as a result the schedules of the people's deputies, who were hurrying to leave for home for the new year celebrations, were disrupted. Such a thing happened once before at the previous session of the Supreme Soviet when, as is already known, a so-called "examination" of this issue was held with an obvious lack of enthusiasm. Naturally, we did not want such a thing to recur, in particular under the time constraints that had developed after the CPSU Central Committee was summoned for an extraordinary plenum. That is why we requested the transfer of the debate on the NKAO problem to the upcoming session of the USSR Supreme Soviet which will open toward the end of January.

The Armenian delegation was the initiator of the congress' declaration condemning the blockade of any sort of transportation. This declaration was endorsed unreservedly—with "only one person voting against it"—in the form we had submitted to the presidium of the congress. If you have noticed, the endorsed declaration is in essence a political assessment of that shameful phenomenon which, for the first time, has been called by its proper name "blockade." This, as is known, is a manifestation of war and oppression. It is well known that the

5 October decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet on measures to normalize the situation in railway transportation—as the blockade is euphemistically called—is not being implemented. The second Congress of the USSR People's Deputies did not examine that problem, which was brought to the attention of the congress by Deputy Sobchak. Consequently, I entertain no particular illusions that the blockade, in particular the blockade of the NKAO, will be over now that this declaration has been endorsed. Anyway, this is the responsibility of the USSR Supreme Soviet and of the Congress of People's Deputies, because the issue involves the image of the Soviet Parliament on which is fixed the attention of the international public.

Diaspora Broadcasters Invited to Seminar

NC2712153589 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 26 Dec 89

[Text] Attention! Armenia's state committee for television and radio broadcasts and the committee for cultural ties with diaspora Armenians are organizing a joint seminar to be held between 10-20 May 1990. The directors of diaspora Armenian radio and television programs in the television and radio stations of foreign countries are invited to the seminar. Hotel, subsistence, and touring expenses will be covered by the state committee for television and radio; guests will have to meet their travel expenses.

Your participation in the seminar will contribute to the consolidation of the ties between the diaspora and the motherland. You will be given wide opportunities to become acquainted with motherland Armenia. You will be taken on sightseeing tours; you will be able to meet with famous persons of your choice and make recordings. You will be presented with cassettes of Armenian music. If you wish to participate in the seminar please write promptly to the following address: Yerevan 25, Mravyan 5, Radio House; or phone us at 552872 and 558660.

Closing of Armenian Chemical Plant Demanded

NC3012121189 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1900 GMT 29 Dec 89

[From the Republican Press Review]

[Text] There are 3 days to go until the end of the year and during this time one of the most vital problems facing the Armenian people must be solved. The Nairit plant must be closed. Many are convinced that the Armenian Supreme Soviet decision on the closure of Nairit is being (?disregarded), Agop Sanasaryan, a member of the Armenian Supreme Soviet commission supervising the closure of Nairit, writes in the newspaper AVANGARD. It has become the rule among us Armenians that we never achieve a victory without first experiencing suffering. In these last 3 days of 1989, we have to exert the utmost efforts to save Yerevan and its environs from a time bomb.

He adds: We should recall that during the June session of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, Vladimir Markaryants, chairman of the Armenian Council of Ministers, stressed that Nairit will remain in Yerevan. In spite of the opposing decision passed by the Supreme Soviet, his deputy, Vladimir Dayan, became the chairman of the commission supervising the decommissioning of Nairit and did everything to toe the line of his superior. The commission [words indistinct] to this shameful attitude aimed at undermining the Supreme Soviet's decision. Vladimir Dayan has now become a preacher at the Nairit collective. During a meeting of the plant's aktiv on 25 December, he declared that the decision of the supreme authority of Armenia cannot be final as long as the USSR Ministry of Chemical Industry exists. It is obvious to us that neither the central nor the local authorities want to close Nairit. The people are again left alone in the face of this danger.

For the last 8 days and nights, picketers have been lining the routes along which raw materials are brought to Nairit. The picketers are not only from Yerevan, but also Armenians from near and far who well understand that the best way to subjugate a people is to keep them in an unhealthy environment and to create an atmosphere of distrust toward their rulers, decisions, and independent steps.

[Yerevan International Service in Armenian at 1630 GMT on 29 December in a report on the same issue says that "every day tens of thousands of people—workers, intellectuals, scientists, and retired people—march toward the Nairit scientific production unit carrying the following slogans: 'Nairi (ancient name for Armenia) without Nairit,' 'For the sake of our children's health,' 'Meet the people's just demand,' and 'The decision of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet remains in abeyance.' Thousands join them along their march." "This enterprise, which does nothing but poison Armenia, must be closed immediately, said Levon Ter-Petrosyan, a member of the administrative board of the Armenian National Movement."]

Uzbek Electoral Process Discussed

90UN0519A Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 24 Nov 89 p 2

[Article by S. Ivanchenko, Deputy Head of the Department of the Soviets' Work under the Presidium of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet: "Well-defined Organization for the Elections"]

[Text] **The present campaign for the election of people's deputies of the Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and deputies of the local soviets will be conducted without the pomp of the previous years, without being organized to death, without the passivity and inertia of electoral commissions and the voters. The spirit of democratization and renewal permeates the altered electoral regulations and the preparation for the election.**

A correctly organized performance of the electoral commissions and of the Soviet's activists becomes of utmost importance in those conditions. The tasks facing them during the campaigning period were discussed at seminars that took place in every oblast of the republic, Karakalpak ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic], and in Tashkent. The main burden of the election campaign is transferred from the executive committees of the local soviets onto the electoral commissions. They will be fully responsible for the correct conduct of the elections in the okrug and in the corresponding area. They will become the main organizers and performers.

One can mention here the high level at which the seminars were conducted in the Andizhan, Surkhandarya and Fergana Oblasts and in Tashkent.

Many problems arise in connection with the process of nominating the candidates for the deputies. It was decided that the right to nominate candidates for the people's deputies of the Uzbek SSR belongs to enterprises of not fewer than 200 employees and also to their branches and other sectors (mines, workshops, etc.), if they have no fewer than 200 employees and have a legal status, i.e. have their own bank account and a seal.

An enterprise can also nominate a candidate only in the okrug where it is physically located. If it is located on the territory of several electoral okrugs, then it has the right to nominate a candidate in only one of those okrugs.

According to the regulations, nomination of candidates for the oblast and the Tashkent city soviets can be done by enterprises with not fewer than 100 employees. For all the other types of soviets the bottom limit was set at 50 employees. That means that enterprises with 50 and more employees can nominate candidates for the rayon, city, city rayon, kishlak and village soviets. Branches and other sectors of enterprises can nominate candidates for the deputies of local soviets, while only those branches and other sectors that have 100 or more employees and possess an independent legal status can nominate candidates for the deputies of the oblast and Tashkent city soviets. According to the regulatons, candidates for deputies can by nominated also by citizens meeting in their residential areas. Such meetings have the right of nominating candidates for people's deputies if 300 or more voters from the okrug are present there and they have been called by the local soviet, its executive committee, the okrug electoral commission, or by any community activists' organ with the support of not fewer than 100 voters. A similar order for voters' meetings has been established for the nomination of candidates for the deputies of local soviets. The number of the participants at such a meeting should be defined by a mutual decision of the corresponding executive committee of the local soviet and the regional electoral commission. If the idea to hold a meeting comes from the voters, then the support of 100 or more voters for the community activists' organ is not required. It is sufficient for the initiating group to apply for the permit to the local soviet executive committee or to the okrug commission. The executive committee of the corresponding local soviet should make a decision to conduct a voters' meeting in their residential area and the same committee then carries the responsibility for the organization and procedure of the meeting. Establishing position limitations in the election process in practice can make it unclear who has the right to run for a deputy. For that one has to know that the electoral regulations establish the incompatibility of a deputy's status with his official position and they provide a list of officials who can not be at the same time deputies of corresponding soviets. This list, for instance, does not include chairmen of people's control committees which means that they may become deputies of the soviets that certify them. But that does not mean that the officials listed in Article 12 cannot be deputies of the soviets that appoint or elect them. If they are nominated as candidates for deputies of these soviets, they have to indicate in their letters of consent that in case of being elected they will either resign from their positions or withdraw their nominations. One should also remember that sessions of local soviets appoint the managers of certain enterprises and organizations. For instance, Kishlak soviets appoint the mangers of kindergartens, stores, etc. The limitations of Article 12 do not include these officials and they can be deputies of the soviet that has appointed them.

Enormous possibilities for nominating candidates are provided for the public organizations of the republic, if they were established according to the law. The nomination of candidates for the people's deputies of the Uzbek SSR can be done at the plenums, conferences, or congresses of the republican, oblast, rayon, city, and city rayon public organizations. A republican public organization has the right to nominate its candidate in any okrug on the territory of the republic; a rayon organization may nominate a candidate in the corresponding rayon, and a city organization—in the city.

Candidates for the deputies of local soviets may be nominated also at the meetings of the primary public organizations. According to the 4 November 1989 decision of the Presidium of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet, primary public organizatons of 100 and more members can nominate candidates for the deputies of the oblast and Tashkent city soviets. Similar organizations with 50 or more members can nominate candidates for the deputies to the rayon and city soviets.

How many candidates to the deputies can be nominated at a single meeting of workers, or the military, or at a plenum or a conference of a public organizaton? According to the elections Regulations, workers of an enterprise, a public organization, a voters' meeting, or a meeting of the military can nominate one candidate for an electoral okrug. One should remember, though, that the meeting can nominate one candidate for a corresponding soviet, but it can also nominate a candidate for each different type of the soviets; for instance, they can choose one candidate for the people's deputies of the Uzbek SSR, one candidate for the deputies of the oblast

soviet, etc. The meeting should comply in that case with the requirements of the regulations to the legality of such meetings.

What happens if the okrug electoral commission is asked to certify as a candidate for the people's deputies of the Uzbek SSR some person who has been nominated in full compliance with all the requirements of the law, but who works and lives outside the territory of the given electoral okrug?

Article 31 of the Regulations on the elections of people's deputies of the Uzbek SSR defines that, as a rule, only persons who live or work on the territory of the corresponding electoral okrug can be nominated as candidates for the people's deputies. An exception from this rule can be made for the outstanding individuals of Uzbekistan who are working in the field of science, art, or literature, for the state and public leaders whose activity involves the entire republic, for the honored factory, kolkhoz and other workers who are well-known to the voters of the Uzbek SSR. In every such case the final decision on certification of the candidate belongs to the corresponding okrug electoral commission.

At the seminars they also discussed some other problems of the correct organization of the election and their legal status. It was decided unanimously that the campaign should proceed in the spirit of the perestroyka and glasnost: They should be democratic and open.

Lithuanian CP 'Provisional' Central Committee Plenum

Endorses Gorbachev Report

LD3012153989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 30 Dec 89

[Text] A plenum of the provisional Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party was held on 29 December to discuss the matter of the extraordinary, December, plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and of the Lithuanian Communist Party's tasks.

The Central Committee plenum endorsed the assessments and conclusions in the report delivered by Comrade Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the extraordinary CPSU Central Committee plenum, and decided to support the decision adopted. The participants in the plenum of the provisional Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party put forward a number of proposals addressed to the CPSU Central Committee.

Proceedings Reported

PM0101172190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Dec 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Plenum Held"]

[Text] The second plenum of the interim Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party was held 29 December to discuss the question: "Concerning the Extraordinary December (1989) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and the Tasks of the Lithuanian Communist Party (Regarding the CPSU Platform)." The Central Committee plenum approved the assessments and conclusions contained in CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's report at the extraordinary plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and decided to endorse the resolution adopted at it.

The plenum of the interim Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party approved a plan of priority measures intended to explain in party organizations, in labor collectives, and among the republic's population the documents of the extraordinary plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and the decisions of the Sixth Conference of the Lithuanian Communist Party. The plenum expressed great concern at the abrupt deterioration of the situation in the republic and at the rapid division among Communists.

The participants in the plenum of the Lithuanian Communist Party's interim Central Committee addressed a number of proposals to the CPSU Central Committee.

'Uncertainty,' 'Confusion' Seen

PM3012193189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Report by Leonid Kapelyushnyy: "When Restraint Is Lacking"]

[Text] Vilnius—A plenum of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party (on the CPSU platform) has been held here. The Central Committee membership is provisional, until an extraordinary congress of the Lithuanian Communists who have decided to remain in the CPSU is convened. The plenum considered three matters—it listened to information on the work of the CPSU Central Committee plenum the other day to discuss the situation in the Lithuanian Communist Party, it adopted a schedule of organizational measures for the immediate future, and it elected a new Central Committee member. But the discussion understandably spilled over into other areas. At the moment the provisional Central Committee lacks premises, communications, and transport. At present it does not have even a rough idea how many Communists in the republic will agree to share the fate of the minority. Speakers anxiously said that each day's delay sows greater uncertainty and confusion among those who share their views. In some speeches the opinion was: We expected more resolute support and understanding from the CPSU Central Committee plenum.

The Communists advocating an independent Lithuanian Communist Party also expected support and understanding from the CPSU Central Committee plenum. A wave of rallies and meetings in support of the decisions of the extraordinary 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party has swept the republic.

Both the former and the latter, it seems to me, are expressing disappointment prematurely—the CPSU Central Committee plenum broke off halfway along the road and a high-ranking delegation is expected to arrive in Lithuania early in the new year.

The words uttered both at rallies of supporters of an independent Communist Party and at the plenum by provisional Central Committee Secretary Vladislav Shved could be the key to the situation at the moment: "Confrontation will bring the Lithuanian people nothing but harm." But each of the sides sees these words as implying alternative solutions and actions.

It has been said on several occasions before and, given the exacerbation of the internal political situation, a note of anxiety was sounded at the plenum: An overwhelming majority does not always display sufficient restraint and tolerance toward people who do not share its views.

Secretary Shved Interview

PM2912222989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Dec 89 First Edition p 1

[Interview with V. Shved, secretary of the interim Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party (on the CPSU platform), by correspondent Colonel V. Gavrilenko: "Common Sense Will Prevail"; date, place not specified]

[Text] An extraordinary plenum of the CPSU Central Committee in Moscow has spent 2 days discussing the decisions of the 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party. Our correspondent talked with plenum participant V. Shved, secretary of the interim Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party (on the CPSU platform), first secretary of Vilnius' Oktyabrskiy party raykom.

[Gavrilenko] Vladislav Nikolayevich, what parting words did you receive, on leaving for the CPSU Central Committee plenum, from the Communists who are firmly resolved to remain in the CPSU?

[Shved] They all said the same thing—convey to the plenum their unshakable comfidence in the correctness of their choice and also their determination to defend this correctness.

[Gavrilenko] What was the atmosphere at the plenum?

[Shved] I confess that I went to the first session feeling pessimistic and with a strong sense of uncertainty. But these feelings were soon erased: We sensed the support and could see that the vast majority of CPSU Central Committee plenum participants, like us, were in favor of a single, indivisible CPSU in a single, indivisible USSR.

[Gavrilenko] What did the leaders of the breakaway Lithuanian Communist Party Algirdas Brazauskas and Vladimir Berezov say in their speeches at the plenum?

[Shved] They tried over and over again to demonstrate the correctness of the decision taken by the Lithuanian Communist Party congress to break away from the CPSU. Their main argument is that it was thus decreed by the majority. But I think it was all decided by individual voting, which faced many Communists with a difficult choice: Support the idea of quitting the CPSU or, by rejecting it, find yourself facing political attacks and moral pressure. Unfortunately, this is the reality of public life in our republic....

[Gavrilenko] What did you say in your plenum speech?

[Shved] My speech was basically an attempt to prove what I regard as two important points. First, I believe that we and the breakaway part of the Lithuanian Communist Party have very many common ideas and aspirations and that what divided us was, maybe, one thing: Their lack of faith and our faith in the fact that Lithuania can only flourish in the future as part of the Union. Second, I said that the split in the party was also due to the fact that a considerable number of Communists, with a rather unclear picture of the republic's future, had succumbed to nationalist feelings. But did everyone know what the social and economic prospects were for an independent Lithuania—what the mood would be at the congress.... In fact it was decided for many communists that they would leave the CPSU—without everyone being asked.

[Gavrilenko] What do you expect from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's trip to Lithuania?

[Shved] I expect many of the vacillating, but honest, Lithuanian Communists will review their position and make the only correct decision—stay in an indivisible CPSU.

[Gavrilenko] Vladislav Nikolayevich, what does the Lithuanian Communist Party (on the CPSU platform), of whose interim Central Committee you are now secretary, intend to do now, immediately?

[Shved] Establish itself from the organizational and ideological viewpoint. That is the first step. Wage an honest and forthright struggle to spread the ideas of a single and indivisible CPSU in a single Union. And, of course, do everything to promote intraparty perestroyka.

[Gaverilenko] Last question. Do you believe you will succeed in avoiding a split in the republic's party organization?

[Shved] That is a very difficult question. The seeds of isolationist sentiments have been cast on fertile soil. Many have sprouted. I still believe that common sense will prevail. But it will take time.

Brazauskas Interview

LD2912180589

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuania at 1400 GMT on 29 December carries a live or recorded 20-minute interview, "the last in the radio's series of regular Friday interviews granted by Algirdas

Brazauskas first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee." The interview is conducted by correspondent Benas Rupeika.

Brazauskas first gives some details about the CPSU Central Committee 25-26 December Plenum in Moscow and discussions on the issue of the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party [CP]. He says that the appeal of the Lithuanian CP to the CPSU outlined all the objectives of the Lithuanian CP, and points out that he read the appeal at the end of his speech, but that the majority did not understand it.

Brazauskas admits that there was no moral pressure at home; on the contrary, people's support was obvious everywhere. He goes on to say: "However, what is the future? A decision not to make a decision with regard to us is also a decision; and the decision to set up a group of members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, headed by M. Gorbachev, to visit Lithuania to talk to our Communists and our people, to people of various convictions...[pauses] of course, this is a very complex task. It is a very complex task for Comrade Gorbachev and to the people who are coming with him, because the Soviet Union is waiting for decisions. And depending on what these decisions will be, conclusions will be made not only about us and Brazauskas. I would imagine that people in Lithuania realize what Gorbachev is in the USSR. Therefore, all this should be linked not only with our interests and our decisions, which of course remain unchanged, there is no doubt about that. I have in mind the decisions of the 20th Lithuanian CP Congress. But then, serious thought must be given to what is going to happen there, in the center, in Moscow. What will the consequences be?"

He says that all this should also concern the Lithuanian people, because all the decisions adopted by the party and the Supreme Soviet need to be implemented, and this could not be done without Moscow's consent, although some people think that it is possible to solve everything here in this republic.

Benas Rupeika then asks about Gorbachev's upcoming visit: "What do you think our position will be? You have already said that the positions would not be changed." Brazauskas says: "Of course, I believe there will be no talk about changing these positions. However, there is going to be a search for ways on how to make this [pauses]...well, say, how shall I put it, how to soften the harshness of this misunderstanding. I would even call it this way: A party misunderstanding."

Rupeika asks: "Are we quoting here the terminology used by some orators at the plenum?"

Brazauskas replies: "The word misunderstanding is very mild indeed. Words of much stronger nature than that were used. Well, we know the Russian language is a very rich language. This was said both about me and about our decisions. I have already spoken about this." He goes on to say that the decisions adopted by 20th Lithuanian CP Congress crossed the boundaries of the competence of Lithuania alone; all these reached the all-union level as well as the international level.

Brazauskas continues: "Now people begin to think about the consequences which our decision may bring, and this is very important. This is very important to us, too. I cannot imagine what additional arguments can be found. The issue does not lie in the arguments, the question is, how to avoid the destruction of the entire situation which currently exists in the center. This is the question. Therefore, more efforts should be laid in the sphere of diplomacy. The real steps in the restructuring are to be taken now, namely, in the restructuring of the party line. It seems that further steps will be taken in the restructuring in this direction. This is not a revolution; this is an evolution."

Rupeika says that journalists' assessments of Brazauskas' work for this year is that although at the start of the year the secretary was the braking force, so that developments did not get out of control, now Brazauskas is in the very center of events.

Having agreed, Brazauskas says that in his view, 1989 was a year of decision-making, and the oncoming year should become the year of results of these decisions, after their implementation. He says that his main concern is how to implement all these decisions.

Brazauskas continues: "The situation is such that various political forces have their own objectives, and the means to achieve these are also their own. It so happens that everybody is in each other's way. One idea I voiced was that there should be a unified front, that somehow the actions of everybody could be coordinated and that these forces would not hinder each other. We want to achieve economic independence, but then others break off the ties without which we cannot achieve this. We don't need this. We must gradually implement all these things, and we must not have any conflicts because we will not achieve anything through conflicts. First, no conflicts between us, then, on the other hand, no conflicts with forces outside; much yet depends on these."

Rupeika asks: "How should I describe your state of mind at the moment? Would it be worry, anxiety, or struggle?" Brazauskas says: "Anxiety describes my feelings now. Anxiety about the developments which will take place in January—the visit of the general secretary." Asked if he knows the exact date, Brazauskas says: "No, not yet. I do not know it. But it should be immediately after the New Year. At the end of January a CPSU Central Committee plenum is to take place. I would imagine that our case, if I can call it that, or the whole conflict, would be concluded at this plenum. Indeed, it seems that other issues which defy solution would be discussed at the plenum, issues which are pressing to the entire Soviet Union. These will not only be about the party and political life, but also, I think, about the state. Therefore, many developments will take place in January which one way or another will also concern Lithuania."

Brazauskas concludes his interview by sending New Year's wishes to the people of Lithuania.

Two Lithuanian Communist Party 'Trends'

LD3112185589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 31 Dec 89

[From the "Seven Days" program presented by Eduard Sagalayev, with Rolandas Pavilenis, Central Committee Bureau member of the Independent Communist Party of Lithuania; and Mikolas Burokyavichyus, secretary of the Provisional Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania, date, place not given—live or recorded]

[Text] [Sagalayev] East Europe's experience is both useful and unacceptable to us. The newspaper cliche about a sixth part of the world is fraught with serious meaning. It is not worthwhile, and even dangerous, for such a huge ship to see itself as a motorboat. The recent events in Lithuania, and to even a greater degree, the results of the CPSU Central Committee plenum suggest such thoughts. And, I think that the ability to refrain from making a decision and from dotting your i's may turn out to be the surest sign of political strength and foresight.

Now, I would like to put some questions to people who occupy key posts in the two—for there are now already two of them—Communist Parties of Lithuania.

Vilnius is on the line. [Turns to television screen showning two men] Are you representing two absolutely independent and autonomous parties, or one party which has two wings, two factions, so that our viewers can get a clearer idea of the situation in which the Communist Party of Lithuania now finds itself?

[Rolandas Pavilenis] First of all, it is a question of the independent Communist Party of Lithuania, which I represent. We have adopted communist party rules in our program. The restoration of Lithuanian statehood and an independent Lithuanian state, and on this basis, the creation of a democratic humanitarian ideal of socialism, primarily; freedom; and social justice, are the main tasks that we have to solve and that will be a prerequisite for solving other tasks.

[Nikolas Burokyavichyus] We too are in favor of the independence of the Communist Party of Lithuania in the economic and social fields, in the field of defining problems of culture, nationalities policy, and the policy of cadres. But we are in favor of retaining the independence of the Communist Party of Lithuania within the composition of the CPSU. And therefore, our position presumes that a successful development of the economy, culture, and social problems of Soviet Lithuania is fully possible only within the composition of the Soviet Union.

[Sagalayev] I seem to understand it correctly that a goal set by the independent Communist Party of Lithuania can be formulated as Lithuania's withdrawal from the composition of the Soviet Union and the finding of its own independence. By what concrete means do you want to attain this goal?

[Pavilenis] We want stability to be maintained both in Lithuania and as regards our ties with the East and the West. Here, the transformations that have been started by our Communist Party are simply an aid to the cause of perestroyka that has commenced in the Soviet Union. Now, on the question of whether we will remain in this union or whether some other decision is taken—that will depend to a substantial degree on perestroyka in the CPSU itself.

[Sagalayev] As it happens, I wanted to ask Mikolas whether he agrees with your stance and your point of view.

[Burokyavichyus] You know, the national hysteria in Lithuania for about a year now has, of course, worked its influence on the minds and consciousness of people. But, people have now started to think more soberly, and the members of the independent Communist Party of Lithuania will, I believe, have second thoughts about their steps. Why do I say this? Because the document has already been adopted and it has been announced that, as of 21 December neither the CPSU rules nor the CPSU program are valid in the independent Communist Party of Lithuania. Why the hurry? Why not wait until the 28th congress? After all, the CPSU is also restructuring itself.

[Sagalayev] Rolands, I would like to ask you how you view the outcome of the most recent CPSU Central Committee plenum, and what you anticipate will come of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to Lithuania.

[Pavilenis] Right, we take a positive view of the outcome of the plenum. Positive, above all, in the sense that no decision was taken that will block the road in the future, so to speak, to dialogue between our Communist Party and the CPSU. That is a very important outcome, and therein lies Mikhail Gorbachev's great contribution. We hope that his dialogue will be continued here in Lithuania, and I would like our processes to be viewed in Moscow and in other places—and indeed in the West—as a natural continuation and as one of the components of those processes that are today going on in Eastern Europe. These are processes of the same order and with the same content.

[Sagalayev] Unfortunately, it is time we finished. A few words if you please, Mikolas.

[Burokyavichyus] A few words. Right. First of all, the division in the Communist Party of Lithuania is one of ideological principle. And I believe it is the task of all Lithuanian Communists—whichever of the two trends that are coming to be organized in the Communist Party of Lithuania to which they might belong—to do all they can to ensure that the national relations between people in Lithuania are the very, very best. That is what I wish

for. I do not believe we need any confrontation whatsoever. Nor do we need people to offend one another. Between us there should be the highest intellectual and ethical culture. That is what I would like to say.

Local Opinions Vary on Split in Lithuanian Party

PM3012195589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 Dec 89 First Edition p 3

[Report by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA special correspondent Captain 3d Class A. Orlov: "Lithuania: Faced With a Choice"]

[Text] It is scarcely necessary to acquaint readers with the situation that has arisen in the republic since the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress. The congress, in the assessment of the CPSU Central Committee December plenum, took a step aimed at an organizational and political break with the CPSU. An assessment that was blunt in a manner typical of the party and not exactly complimentary. How did the Lithuanian Communists take it?

Opinions varied, as it is now customary to say. Moreover, they were diametrically opposed in some cases. At the "Kommunar" plant, for example, where the party committee tried to explain the situation, the majority of working people support the plenum's decision and some even criticize the CPSU Central Committee for delaying its support. At the heating equipment plant and the "Venta" Production Association views were divided roughly 50-50 in favor of the plenum decision and against it. Everywhere people are deciding their positions and ideas.

But these are opinions within collectives. What is the position of the majority of the mass media? As yet there is practically no reaction to the CPSU Central Committee plenum in the Lithuanian papers. But there are report on rallies in support of the formation of an independent Lithuanian Communist Party with its own program and statutes.

Journalists are in no hurry to cover the activities of those participants in the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress who have continued to espouse the CPSU platform. It was not until 28 December that the resolution of the 6th conference of the Lithuanian Communist Party and its appeal to the republic's Communists were published in full.

A provisional Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party was elected at the conference (it was held 22 December) and is now conducting explanatory work among the republic's working people. The aim, as the appeal says, is to "consolidate Lithuanian Communists loyal to the ideological and organizational principles of the party whose program and statutes they voluntarily accepted..." The appeal also contains the following lines: "Having preserved and renewed the Lithuanian Communist Party, we will protect perestroyka from degenaration and will ensure the genuine rebirth of the Lithuanian people and the hopes and aspirations of all inhabitants of Soviet Lithuania..."

Yes, the republic's Communists are today faced with a choice. An unprecedented situation: Two Central Committees already exist, which means there are two Communist parties. The division is a fact. There are also moves to call the party that continues to espouse the CPSU platform the "Russian" (although most of its secretaries are Lithuanians) Party and the "Night" Party (the 6th party conference was forced to meet on the night after the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress). It must be noted that before the group of CPSU Central Committee plenum participants starts work in Lithuania and before their meetings with Communists, a kind of time-out has been declared, but people are asking themselves: Will it be possible to bring the two halves together? If so, on what basis?

"We do not want to influence people in a particular direction," I. Nauyekas, member of the provisional Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, said in conversation with me, "and we do not want to say anything bad about the part of the Lithuanian Communist Party that is now independent. In principle common sense and closeness to the people must prevail. Perhaps a referendum is needed, a poll of all Communists."

On 29 December, at the Oktyabrskiy Lithuanian Communist Party Rayon Committee in Vilnius, there was a plenum of the provisional Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party that continues to espouse the CPSU platform. It examined questions of the Lithuanian Communist Party's organizational activity and work to preserve primary party organizations and create party newspapers, since the whole of the party press remains in the hands of the breakaway Lithuanian Communist Party.

Corresponding steps are being taken by the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party that has become independent. Here too they need the support of the broad masses of Communists...

The latest news is that the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers has registered the statutes of the independent Lithuanian Communist Party. The Lithuanian Democrats Party has also been registered.

Split Discussed

LD3012111789 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 29 Dec 89

[Text] Today a meeting of first secretaries of district and regional party committees took place in the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party. Party organizational and ideological issues were discussed. It was stressed that every Communist of Lithuania should decide for himself, (?as if) he joins the independent Lithuanian Communist Party of remain member of the Lithuanian Communist Party subordinate to Moscow.

The reorganization of the party is going to end only at the beginning of April, so there will be enough time to think over all pros and cons. The dissent in opinion should by no means become a basis for confrontation. Unity and calm is especially needed in Lithuania at present. Concern over conflicts between the local inhabitants and servicemen of the Soviet Army units stationed in Lithuania was voiced at today's meeting.

Lithuanians Cited on Independent Party

PM0201102190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 30 Dec 89 Second Edition p 2

[Report by TASS correspondent K. Ustsila under the rubric "Lithuania These Days": "Two Central Committees and Many Opinions"]

[Text] Vilnius—Right up to the last working day of the stormy year of 1989 now receding into history, no more topical problem could be found in the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] capable of pushing the theme of party life into the background. Questions of the further destiny of the Lithuanian Communist Party and the provisions of the report delivered by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the CPSU Central Committee extraordinary plenum and of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum resolution "On Questions Connected With the Decisions of the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress" are occupying the minds and hearts not only of Communists but also of virtually all inhabitants of the republic. As was to be expected, the proclamation of the independence of the Lithuanian Communist Party by the Lithuanian Communists' congress, the adoption of its own program and statute, and the materials of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum, which gave an assessment of this step, are the main subject of talks in the crowded morning trolleybuses and in the labor collectives. No one is surprised any longer by the most diverse, contradictory opinions and assessments.

"Yesterday we had an expanded session of the enterprise party committee," S. Nagornyy, secretary of the Vilnius No 8 motor transport enterprise party committee and member of the Lithuanian Communist Party provisional Central Committee, said in a talk with your TASS correspondent. "The majority of party committee members and other speakers at the session approved the provisions set forth in the report delivered by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Some militated for extreme, resolute measures."

A. Matulyavichyus, general director of the Vilnius "Neringa" production association, is disinclined to agree with this:

"We believe that it is still too early to hold a meeting. We prefer individual work. I can say that in our collectives there are supporters of an independent communist party and those who advocate a communist party within the CPSU."

V. Martinkus, chairman of the board of the Lithuanian Writers Union, elected at the congress as a member of the Central Committee of the Independent Communist Party, believes that the Lithuanian Communists' decision was predetermined by the fact that to this day there has essentially been no reform in the CPSU. The fact that the CPSU Central Committee is promising perestroyka in the party for tomorrow, the representative of the creative intelligentsia believes, cannot be a guarantee of the successful activity of Lithuanian Communists today.

"Today our main task is to preserve the party organizations which stand on the positions of the CPSU platform," M. Burokyavichyus, secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party provisional Central Committee, said in a talk with your TASS correspondent. "At the same time it is very important, while remaining loyal to our convictions, to avoid confrontations, not to offend our opponents, and to assess realistically the situation which has taken shape."

And the most recent news is that the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers has registered the statute of the independent Lithuanian Communist Party. The party of Lithuanian democrats has also been registered.

Lithuanian Parties Meet, Officials Interviewed

LD2912221489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 29 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Correspondent Paulyus reports:

[Paulyus] [video shows a meeting in progress] A week ago an extraordinary 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party ended, the decision of which has already been felt by the republic's entire Communist family numbering 2,000 people. Two Central Committees—the Central Committee of the Independent Communist Party [CP] of Lithuania and the provisional Central Committee of the Lithuanian CP on the CPSU Platform—have embarked on work related to the decisions of this congress. The results of the congress and of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the plans for the very near future were discussed at today's meeting of the leaders of the Independent CP of Lithuania with the first secretaries of the city and rayon party committees.

[Begin Yu. Paletskis recording; captioned as secretary of the Lithuanian CP Central committee] A great many things have been done spontaneously by primary organizations, rayon and city organizations. Great support has been given to the decisions of the 20th congress. Of course, party members will now have to think, and think seriously, among other things, about what was said in Moscow at the December CPSU Central Committee Plenum. What is also very important is that in Lithuania everyone—communists and nonparty members, young and elderly people—are waiting for the visit of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. It will be the first time that a

leader of our party and our state visit Lithuania. Unfortunately, in almost 50 years of Soviet power, this has not yet taken place. They are waiting for him in very good spirits, recognizing his, I would say, great services to perestroyka and to everything, all the good changes, which are under way in our republic, too. They are waiting for him with hope for a good dialogue, and mutual understanding. This visit must be historic for us. [end recording]

[Paulyus] [video shows a meeting in progress] The same agenda was discussed at the same time, but in another building, by the Provisional Central Committee of the Lithuanian CP on the CPSU Platform, at its first plenum today.

[Begin V.N. Shved recording; captioned as secretary of the Central Committee of the "Lithuanian CP on the CPSU Platform"] Our main task is propaganda and an explanation of the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum. I believe that the plenum acted very wisely in interrupting its work and in trying to find the points for solutions, if one could put it this way, the points of contact here—not at the plenum, or in Moscow, but precisely in the republic. It is of course difficult to say how everything will work out. But, you see, the actual split and the actual problems of confrontation—they will, above all, do harm to the Lithuanian people and to the republic. We realize this very well. [end recording]

Lithuanian Council of Ministers Registers Parties

LD2912213889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1800 GMT 29 Dec 89

[Text] A TASS correspondent reports from Vilnius:

Questions concerning the future destiny of the Communist Party of Lithuania, the tenets of the report of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the extraordinary plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, the decision of the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee on the issues in connection with the decisions of the 20th congress of the Communist Party of Lithuania interst not only communists, but practically all inhabitants of Lithuania.

Yesterday there was an expanded session of the Party Committee of the enterprise (Nagornyy), secretary of the Party Committee of the eighth Vilnius motor transport enterprise and member of the Provisional Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania, said in his conversation with a TASS correspondent. The majority of the members of the Party Committee, and of those who spoke at the sitting, approved the tenets expressed in the report of Comrade Gorbachev. Some stood up for extreme and resolute measures. However, taking into consideration the fact that the situation in the party organization of the republic is complex and ambiguous, the Party Committee came to the opinion that it ought not adopt any definite decisions on the delimitation of the party prior to the conclusion of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

(Martinkus), chairman of the board of the Writers' Union of Lithuania, who was elected a member of the Central Committee of the Independent Communist Party at the congress, believes that the fact that essentially no reform in the CPSU has yet got underway predetermined the decision of the Lithuanian communists. The representatives of the creative intelligentsia think that the fact that the CPSU Central Committee is promising perestroyka in the Party for tomorrow, cannot guarantee successful activities of the communists of Lithuania today.

Our main goal is to preserve the party organizations which favor the positions of the CPSU platform, (Burakyavichus) secretary of the Provisional Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania, said. At the same time it is very important, while remaining true to one's convictions, to avoid confrontation, not to insult one's opponents, and evaluate the created situation in a realistic way.

Life goes on in the republic. Meetings in Vilnius, Kaunas, Klaipeda, and some other towns and rayons have been held at which support for the decisions of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of Lithuania was expressed. On 28 December all the republican paper published the decision and also the appeal to the communists of the republic by the Lithuanian Communist Party's sixth conference that advocated an independent Communist Party of Lithuania within the unified CPSU, which is restructuring.

The latest news is as follows: The Council of Ministers of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic has registered the statute of the independent Communist Party of Lithuania. Lithuania's Party of Democrats has also been registered.

Lithuanian Aspirations Undercut By Economy

PM0201100790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[Colonel V. Kulpinskas report: "Lithuania: Something To Think About"]

[Text] Supporters of the Lithuanian Communist Party's separation from the CPSU regard this step as the chief, obligatory trump in the election struggle for power, without which, in their opinion, victory in this struggle is impossible. Is this so?

Can the Lithuanian Communist Party be the ruling party in the republic while continuing to espouse the CPSU platform? This is the chief topic of argument, the crux of the whole internal party debate which took place prior to the congress and which is essentially continuing now. The distribution of forces at the congress and the voting

results showed that the concept of the Lithuanian Communist Party's full independence is dominant at present. Another question: Is it correct, does it meet the vital interests of the republic's working people, and is it a panacea against all ills?

While present at the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress, reading the drafts of the documents submitted to it, and then listening to the debate on them, I constantly came back to this thought: Much of what was being submitted and proposed could be resolved within the framework of the CPSU and the Soviet federation. If, of course, we had a renewed, more clear-cut platform—drafts of new CPSU Statutes and a new Program incorporating many points and concepts now being debated. For example, we undoubtedly need a section in the statutes on the union republic communist parties. They are now essentially reduced to the level of kray and oblast party organizations. And this does not suit the majority of the republic's Communists....

However, today it is more important, of course, not to reflect on what could have been done before but to accurately forecast the possible future development of events. The question of Lithuania's secession from the USSR was not raised or even touched upon either in the congress documents or in the delegates' speeches. And A. Brazauskas pointed this out at a briefing following his reelection as first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee. But everyone who follows the republic press and the development of events here realizes that this question is not being taken off the agenda but is merely being postponed indefinitely. How is Lithuania's future status seen? An independent democratic socialist republic...? For the time being "independent" stands alongside "socialist." For the time being. But in reality the "Western model" is being preached and extolled—sometimes little by little, sometimes openly. And here the word "independence" has a hypnotic effect.

But after a session of hypnosis a person invariably returns to the real world.

A speaker setting out for a rally to make a fiery speech on Lithuania's independence well knows that he will fill up his car at the gas pump without difficulty (provided he has the money). He habitually turns on his electric or gas stove, confident that it will unfailingly emit warmth. He puts on his shirt (preferably of cotton) without giving a thought to the hands that grew and picked the cotton.

But the speaker will not speak of this at the rally. Too bad. But why do economists keep quiet about this? Why does the voice of politicians, sometimes quite irresponsible ones, dominate everywhere? Do they perhaps have information about the discovery of a new Samotlor somewhere near Gargzhday? Or perhaps coal deposits have been discovered somewhere in the region of Birzhay or Paneryay?

I do not want to resort to didactic tones. And yet anyone with even the slightest knowledge of economics realizes that firm union deliveries of fuel, metal, and other raw materials are one thing, while commercial prices on the world market with its market conditions and fluctuations are quite a different matter. The figures cited in M.S. Gorbachev's report at the extraordinary CPSU Central Committee Plenum give us great food for thought.

"A Lithuania without sovereignty is a Lithuania without a future"—this slogan is very popular in the republic now. Today, I believe, it reflects the majority of public opinion. And yet it does not run counter to the policy of perestroyka and the spirit of the recent CPSU Central Committee Plenum. M.S. Gorbachev spoke of this very precisely and definitely in his report too: "We proceed from the premise that the republic communist parties' independence is just as possible and desirable as the republics' sovereignty within the framework of a renewed federation."

Uzbek Party Criticizes Lithuanian Breakaway

LD3012152889 Moscow TASS in English 1513 GMT 30 Dec 89

[Text] Tashkent December 30 TASS—Participants in the meeting of activists of the Uzbek Communist Party and economic executives of the republic held here today described the decision by the 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party to break away from the national Communist Party as unprecedented.

At a turning point of history we need as air the unity and cohesion of the party which launched perestroyka and guides it along the difficult path of drastic transformations, [a] speaker at the meeting said.

In the present complex situation a decisive rebuff should be given to those who try to discredit the party. Further passivity of many party comittees is intolerable and dangerous. The speakers were unanimous that perestroyka in the party cannot lag behind the processes under way in society.

Islam Karimov, first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, spoke at the meeting.

Bolshevik Revolution Termed 'Death to Freedom'

LD1112144089 Vilnius GIMTASIS KRASTAS in Lithuanian No 45, 10-15 Nov 89 pp 1, 4, 5

[Article by assistant editor Rimvydas Valatka entitled "Great Revolution as Death to Freedom"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The authors of "The History of the CPSU" write unabashedly: "The very important worldwide significance of the October Revolution rests in the fact that it was the first world revolution to provide for the people not only political rights, but also the material conditions for a life of prosperity." According to that version of history, the revolution also demonstrated the only just solution of the international problem.

A military parade dedicated to the observance of the Great Revolution, still referred to officially as The Great October Revolution, is again planned this year in Lithuania. Also this year, a meeting was held at the Vilnius City Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party [CP] to discuss preparations for the 72d anniversary of the revolution.

It was announced by the city newspaper that participants at the meeting had raised questions about the necessity to increase consumer goods distribution throughout city stores on the eve of the anniversary, as well as during the anniversary itself. Menwhile, V. Chadunkinas, secretary of the Party Committee of the Institute of Scientific Electrographic Research, noted more attention should be given by the mass information media to preparations for important dates.

The logic: If holiday goods counters fail to differ from those of everyday there will be even more eye openings, of which there has been an overabundance of late. Such are the traditions of Bolshevism: let us deceive the masses with promises and give them a loaf of bread as a Great October victory, while giving the nonbelievers a revolutionary knights' fist. Sounds lovely, doesn't it?

The death penalty was instituted in 1917 by the Kerensky government. The Bolsheviks were the first to cry out: "Down with Kerensky's death penalty!" However, when, following the Great Revolution, the socialists requested the abolition of the death penalty, V. Lenin ridiculed them. The Chekists [secret police] alone put to death 8,389 people in the 1 and ½ years immediately following the revolution. Let us compare: The tsars, who have been accused of everything, inflicted the death penalty on 894 people between 1826 and 1906. One notes that there was a civil war in progress, but during the 6 months of Stolypin's reaction (1906), following the 1905 revolutionary battles, 950 people were given the death penalty. That was all. In 1922, when Lenin instituted the draft law with six crimes meriting the death penalty, he added six more. That included the one we curse Stalin for: for propaganda and agitation. Unlawful failure to return from abroad, is also included there.

Currently, as the economy built by the commissariats and the NKVD upon peoples bones and an industry of total poverty is being crushed by the teeth of a crisis, it is time to ask: What sins have we committed to be forced to honor such a revolution and its instigators?

What has it brought for people and nations?

Freedom, equality? A right for workers to decide their own affairs and to participate in public rule? Did it do away with privileges? Disappearance of exploitation? Have no political prisoners remained in exile and prisons after 1917? Was the entire government authority given over to the Soviets? At what point following the revolution did they have authority? The raykoms—yes, they had it. The Gubkoms (OGPU, NKVD, KGB) had it, but the Soviets are to this day asking for governing authority.

Land for the people? It was given and taken away. This operation was accomplished, in Lithuania, especially quickly.

The promised peace?

Throughout the 72-year history—a cult of war and of threats to others: the imperialistic war with Finland, the annexation of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and Bessarabia, the forced entry into Hungary and Czechoslovakia and the war in Afghanistan. Furthermore, not one of these has been condemned by the government. Even a military-patriotic education has been formulated.

In place of the tsar's prisons and honorable revolutionary trials, utilizing the services of attorneys sworn in for that purpose, secret "troyka" trials and a mighty Gulag system, unequaled even by fascist concentration camps. Tens of millions of peasants have perished during the collectivization starvation period and in camps, and hundreds of thousands were murdered in NKVD torture strongholds. The Crimean Tatars, Chechen, and Volga German nationalities have been transplanted in one night, while other nations have totally disappeared. There exists technical and social retardation, and the specter of hunger stalks a state that is one of the wealthiest in natural resources. A shortage of soap exists, as in wartime.

However, even today an opinion is insistently being foisted upon us, advising us to reflect on the fact that there have also been victories, including socialist construction, Dneprohes, Magnitka, and the industrialization of Lithuania (with which we do not know what to do, since we have enterprises we have no need of and are lacking enterprises we do need) etc. No shame is evident and eyes are shut to the cost of such "victories,"—50-60 million dead and how many additional millions with broken destinies.

Even currently, activists appear on the scene, whose tongue sticks in heir throats when it comes to admitting that mistakes have been made and there have been excesses. Such is the party principle of succession: Stalin is to blame, while the Party is like a newborn babe. According to N. Khrushchev, violations against Leninist principles commenced approximately around 1934. What then constitutes Leninist principles? To torture and imprison in camps socialist revolutionaries and Mensheviks, members of the intelligentsia and peasants—Leninist principles. But when that affected the Bolsheviks themselves, they were no longer Leninist principles.

The "enemy of the people" concept is not Josef's [Stalin] discovery. V. Lenin's good friend, P. Krasikov, in 1922 thus baptized the popular Petrograd Metropolitan, Venyamin, and condemned him to death without cause. V. Lenin was also aware of this. At the time, treasures were being shamelessly robbed from Russian Orthodox churches. In his letter of 19 May 1919 to "Iron Felix," Lenin advised him to chase the writers abroad. "In practice, these are not the brains (of the nation), but

rather its excrement," retorted V. Lenin to M. Gorkiy, who had tried to intercede (following the revolution) on behalf of the abused intelligentsia. "Traitor," "lackey," "servant," "agent," "Judas, bought for 30 silver coins"—were among the names given by V. Lenin to his opponents. Stalin extended and further developed such traditions of Leninism beautifully.

A Lenin like that would not appear attractive, thus he was not portrayed in this manner. Leninists, en masse, put forth a different image—a family man and friend, instead of V. Lenin, the politician. He was truly different with his family and with friends. In this respect, he differed vastly from Stalin, whose political and personal characteristics were alike. Apparently only the fact that, until Lenin's death, the party of the Bolsheviks was characterized by a spirit of lively discussion and struggle of opinions could be regarded as "Leninist norms," while afterward, it was destroyed by Stalin (and not by him exclusively). However, even while Lenin was alive this type of spirit had already taken its leave from the public.

The revolution was neither sacred nor infallible nor necessary. It was necessary to a small group of people who wished to seize power. The fact that in 1917, against the background of World War I, it became unavoidable is a different matter. However, do we presently, 72 years later, have to revere something they unfortunately were unable to avoid?

The Social Democrats (Mensheviks) asserted that the revolution in Russia could not win for at least another 100 years: The country is backward, the majority of its population are peasants. V. Lenin, however, retorted in a manner characteristic of him, but now an opportune moment had arisen for seizure of power, thus discrediting K. Marx, who had claimed a revolution to be least likely to succeed in Russia. In 1917, all of V. Lenin's zeal was concentrated toward Russia's bypassing the road of capitalism, for it to be able and to be compelled to go along the path of proletarian revolution (something he had fought against in his youth).

If there exists such a desire to worship V. Lenin, then he is worthy of respect, because he was the first and so far the only Bolshevik leader who apparently came to realize his mistake and in his last "note," which PRAVDA hastened to label as "false," wrote in 1923: "We have perished...all this is leading to a total pulverization of Russia."

Freedom's sun remained extinguished in the new empire for long decades. The "avant garde" party apparatus assumed a monopoly on truth and justice. The black force swept aside everything "old" (created by people) and fear reigned supreme. Force became everything, thinking was outside the law. V. Lenin's Orders were presented for murders and betrayals. V. Lenin, who despised with the full force of his fanaticism Russia's enslavement, himself contributed to making local slavery surpass even oriental slaveries.

Naturally, the revolution gave rise to millions of romanticists, but that obviously did not change anything. Some of them perished, while others became fanatics. The hybrid of the revolution and the secret police gave birth to a force which to this day we can neither grasp nor label. We say: the Army, KGB, the party apparatus and the mafia; but it seems to me, that force consists of something within them and yet beyond them. When M. Gorbachev says there exists a guarantee of restructuring, that is nonsense. If this is how things are, restructuring is temporary.

Neither MOSCOW NEWS nor ARGUMENTY I FAKTY should be blamed for a restoration of capitalism, but should rather be relied upon. Democracy should not be blamed for unloaded railway cars standing in stations; but now is the time for an unsuccessful premier to write his letter of resignation. It is also time to tell the nations not half of the truth, but all of it: the war which is in progress between the Armenians and the Azerbaijanis, the Abkhazians and the Georgians, the Uzbeks and the Mesketian Turks, and the economic ruin are all the logical consequences of the Revolution. Otherwise, we are going to pussyfoot about in one spot and be ridiculously concerned about M. Gorbachev.

A timely clarification of where 1917 has hurled Russia and other nations will provide the means to overcome the mafia, the corruption, and the racketeering. Knowledge is a sensation of freedom.

The raising of humanistic ideals above those of class, thanks to M. Gorbachev, is already indicative of the beginning of the end of the adoration of V. Lenin and the Revolution as icons. These words have not been made flesh thus far. Our troubles and sacrifices will increase if we continue to be forced to build our future home unthinkingly (even the common European home!) upon false foundations.

Pitfalls of Baltic Independence Enumerated

LD3012123289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0603 GMT 30 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 30 Dec (TASS)—TASS Commentator Andrey Orlov writes:

The law on the economic independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, whereby these three Baltic republics receive extensive rights in the utilization of their own resources, underground wealth, and production capacities, comes into force from the first day of the new year.

The law was adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet on the initiative of Baltic delegates, and, although preparations for its implementation are in full swing in the republics, even more radical proposals right up to separation from the USSR are already being heard in the Baltic area. The framework of economic independence, which has not yet had time to become a reality, is already hampering the supporters of separation, which they see as a panacea against all troubles.

The economic relationships of the union republics that now exist between themselves and with the center are, of course, far from ideal. However, for all the imperfection of these links, their abrupt severance will most probably bring results that are the reverse of what is expected.

After all, the advanced industry of the Baltic republics is only the top of a triangle based on their links with union republics. The success of Baltic industry has, to a great extent, been determined precisely by these links, in particular, the existence "nearby" of raw materials that are cheap compared with world prices, as well as the guaranteed marketing of output on the country's truly immense market.

Supporters of separation from the USSR do not hurry to reply when asked about the alternatives to these links. At the same time, many economists in the Baltic republics themselves think that the talk of separation is naive. Industrial output bearing the mark "Made in the Baltic area" will, in the foreseeable future, scarcely squeeze out its Western counterparts in the world market. As for the prospects of exporting meat and dairy produce to Europe, this idea will most probably only evoke a condescending smile on the part of Finnish and Dutch farmers.

How about tourism then? This can be a good source of income, but only given the existence of the proper infrastructure, whose creation requires considerable initial capital. Hopes of creating a united market of the three republics look ill-founded owing to the homogeneous character of their economic structures.

The path whereby the Baltic republics, availing themselves of all the advantages of the federation as a raw materials, manpower, and selling market, would assume the role of the "locomotive" of economic reforms in the union, appears far more promising. Economic logic demands the joint development of the federation.

German-Lithuanian Newspaper Published in Klaipeda

LD2712144889 Moscow TASS in English 1422 GMT 27 Dec 89

[Text] Klaipeda December 27 TASS—The German-Lithuanian Cultural Society created this year has brought out the first issue of the newspaper DEUTSCHE NACHRICHTEN FUR LITAUEN. This monthly newspaper will be published in the port city of Klaipeda and will cover the life of Germans living in Lithuania, their cultural heritage and contacts with Germans from other countries.

The first issue of the newspaper carries an article by Professor Alvidas Liaukonis-Flikk entitled "Lithuanian Germans", the rules of the German-Lithuanian society, memoirs, various information and advertisements.

The newspaper reports that by the decision of the municipal council the new society will be given an old building in the medieval part of Klaipeda. After restoration it will include a conference hall, a library, rooms for studies and a restaurant with German cuisine.

Maltreatment of Estonian Draftees Claimed

PM2712145489 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 18 Dec 89 p 11

[Stefan Lundberg dispatch: "Estonia—Deserters Flee Revenge"]

[Text] Tallinn—At present several groups of Estonian deserters are on the run from army units around the Soviet Union.

Juri Liim, one of the leaders of conscientious objectors in the Geneva-49 organization, said that dozens of Estonian conscripts have suffered death as a result of ill-treatment in the Soviet Union.

"Estonian conscripts' leave has been suspended and at present the security troops are searching all trains bound for Estonia in the hunt for the deserters," Juri Liim said.

"The boys are trying to flee home from units around the Soviet Union.

"Also, in the last 3 weeks five Estonian conscripts have arrived home in sealed lead coffins," Liim said.

Not even relatives are allowed to see the bodies. The coffins are guarded around the clock until the funerals. The official reason for death is given as suicide. "Suicides" among young Estonian conscripts have increased dramatically in the last year, Geneva-49 said.

The organization was founded 31 October and has already registered 500 conscientious objectors. Its name comes from the agreement signed in Geneva in 1949 banning occupying powers from drafting the citizens of occupied countries into military service.

The small room at the organization's offices in Tallinn is filled with young men. They have come to hand back their draft cards. These are passed on to the military authorities by the organization. The men are not conscientious objectors; they simply refuse to serve in the Soviet Army anywhere that is far from home.

"We want to do our military service in the Estonian army," 18-year-old Rannar Roots said.

He has been drafted to carry out his military service on the Kola Peninsula. Rannar is convinced that there will be no repercussions because of his refusal.

"If there are, I don't give a damn," he said.

"Most of my friends think the same."

The military authorities have threatened legal action against those refusing military service. Juri Liim does not think that the authorities will bring actions against all those refusing military service.

"The position of Estonians in the army is now so bad that parents are even hiding their children," Liim said.

In particular it is the worrying large number of cases of death through ill-treatment that has given rise to the reaction. Estonian conscripts are thought to be having to pay for the republic's struggle for freedom. Officers at military units are accused not only of turning a blind eye, but also of encouraging revenge by the Russians.

"Our conscripts have also been forced to clean up after the reactor accident at Chernobyl," Liim said.

In the past demobilized Estonian conscripts have reported that they were allowed to return home for cleaning up on top of the destroyed reactor for 90 seconds.

In order to make the refusal to do military service more effective, the organization is now encouraging young fathers to refuse to take part in refresher training exercises.

At a press conference in Helsinki in August Soviet Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov said that he does not accept that young men from the Baltic republics should be allowed to do their military service in their home countries.

Prospective Estonian Parties Expound Goals

PM2712150389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 11

[Leonid Levitskiy report under rubric "Direct Line. IZVESTIYA Correspondents at the Teleprinter": "Platforms of Future Parties"]

[Text] Tallinn—The republic youth newspaper NOORTE HAAL has published the theses of the program "On the Road to an Estonian Social Democratic Party." It is not possible to retell or cite the theses—they take up over half a page. Briefly—about the aims of the future party, which, it is said, will be formed 11-12 January in Tartu at the first forum of Estonian social democrats. They include the achievement of a free, independent Estonian state in which a balance of the interests of the individual and society and the harmonization of relations between groups and strata of the population must be achieved, and priority given to moral values over political values. The idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat is recognized as profoundly erroneous. The need to overcome national nihilism, which is now called proletarian internationalism, and deideologize culture and education is stressed. The social democratic party, the theses note, resolutely opposes the militarization of society and will aim for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Estonia.

The authors of the theses believe that the outlined aims must be sought only by peaceful, nonviolent actions. Among those who signed the appeal was Maryu Lauristin, USSR people's deputy and member of the Estonian Communist Party.

The same newspaper published the manifesto of the free Estonian democrats 20 December. They immediately give notice that they are not speaking in defense of any social group. They are geared to freedom of thinking and favor free enterprise and individualism rather than collectivism. The guarantee of achieving this is a free, independent, Europe-oriented Estonia. The ways of acquiring freedom are a question of tactics. But, in the authors' opinion, people must be ready to make use of every opportunity.

One of the signatories of the document was Enn Pyldroos, candidate member of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau.

Estonian Social Democrats Discuss Program

LD2912215789 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1200 GMT 20 Dec 89

[Excerpts] [Sinissaar] This is Tallinn. The time is 1400. Good day, "Antenna" listeners. Program host Tiit Sinissaar is in the studio. [passage omitted]

Now over to the subject of today's program. On 15 December the program theses of the Estonian Social Democratic Independence Party appeared in NOORTE HAAL as well as in EDASI [Tartu newspaper]. Today we will indeed talk about this first and foremost even if in today's NOORTE HAAL there is also already the manifesto of the Estonian Free Democrats and the idea of also founding an Estonian Liberal People's party is spreading. But those have come about slightly later, so today we will talk about the Estonian Social Democratic Independence Party which is to be founded.

In Tallinn there are three of us in the studio, with Rein Veidemann [a leader of the Estonian People's Front] and Peet Kask, but there is also the Tartu studio. Colleague Madis Ligi, please take over.

[Ligi] We have in the studio two men from the university: Peeter Vihalemm [member of the council of the People's Front] and Mihkel Parnoja. [passage omitted giving telephone numbers for listeners' questions]

[Sinissaar] But let us start from the beginning: Why was it necessary in your opinion to establish the Estonian Social Democratic Independence Party? Rein Veidemann?

[Veidemann] [passage omitted] Firstly, at the level of the Soviet Union. We have now seen here, with time and practice having borne it out, that state socialism has reached complete bankruptcy. I am not talking about communism; one can only scare [others] with it or one can still have visions of it in dreams. That is one theory of this kind, at the level of ideology.

The second level in the Soviet Union is this: The Communist Party—I have in mind the CPSU—is at the moment in the state of Muenchhausen [reference to Baron Muenchhausen]. It cannot pull itself up by its hair and transform, transform internally. So those changes

have to take place externally; they can take place only under a multi-party system, so that each party can find a...well, community of its own whose interests it represents and protects.

On the international level I would highlight this aspect: Now at last one will have to square up with World War II; in fact, the post-World War II period must come to a close. That means that we see how the ideologically national liberation movement is taking place for peoples and states at present and Europe is truly becoming a common home, but a home cannot be divided with concrete walls and ideologies because that would immediately lead up to a civil war. Likewise, the balance hitherto—based on fear—will have to change. It must be replaced with different principles of balance: It should be of the type and dynamic of dialogue. This, in brief, would be the view from the international level.

At the same time it would mean...a need which manifests itself this way that we have to kind of restore a tradition. The tradition of social democracy in Estonia did exist. It emerged here through independent thought and in a constant fight against bolshevism. One could say that bolshevism indeed is what has continuously been imported to us. It has been, let us say, an agency of the Soviet state in Estonia, or its kind of apparatus of pressure, up until now.

At the level of Estonia I would like to say this much. Why we need this is that we no longer have a need to persuade each other that we are advancing in the direction of an independent Estonian state. The question which would pose a greater interest is what kind of life this will be within the independent Republic of Estonia? In our opinion a certain danger will still be there that we will be pushed into a type of extreme left position and that within a free competition a situation may arise which will push us to the other extreme. So one needs to balance this out as much as possible, to keep the center almost in place. For this we also need social democracy.

And one could say that alongside the [word indistinct] aspect we should like to emphasize also a certain pragmatic aspect—meaning that at the moment we are constantly being told that the Communist Party of Estonia is the only channel, the only outlet to protect Estonian interests in Moscow. I know, this is a kind of basic way to frighten [a person]. If we here in Estonia succeed in annulling Article 6 in the Constitution—I hope that it will take place in the course of the current year still—then indeed it will already be possible—and even obligatory—to hold talks with Moscow at the level of our parliament and our own authority. Those clever and powerful telephones over there, on a desk in the party building, on a desk on the tenth floor which are linked up to the KGB and the army will have to be relocated to be either with the president or with the government. So this is a kind of need which will still need to be resolved first as we move toward a number of parties.

And the last one, at the level of an individual; that I will say from my personal viewpoint. Once and for all this schizophrenic situation should come to an end for those people, this hypocrisy which has been imposed upon us for years... I would say, for decades, with us formally being members of the Communist Party but in essence carrying social democratic views all the time in our hearts. [passage omitted]

[Peet Kask] One should analyze not only the crimes of Stalin, but also Lenin—this kind of theoretical legacy, and indeed, the meaning of his activity. Likewise, a theoretical analysis of this kind is necessary at the international level. Well, Western social democracy is at present in a crisis situation or carries manifestations of a crisis. This is also to a large extent linked to the fact that perhaps the role of nationality has been underestimated, along with the role of the ethnic movement. That is, the name of our party—the national, or Social Democratic Independence Party—is not accidental. [passage omitted]

[Sinissaar] We will proceed with a listener's question. The question has been worded as follows: Why could not the People's Front set up a Social Democratic Independence Party; why should there be a new party? That is I understand why could not the People's Front rename itself as such?

[Veidemann] This is how things stand with the People's Front. I could see for myself at the last Council [meeting]. The issue is namely that when the People's Front emerged; it emerged as a union of a higher kind, so to speak, of people carrying very diverse ideas, of people's associations. The common interest for all was to direct Estonia toward democratic parliamentarism or onto the path of parliamentarism. Now we are quite close to the emergence of this parliamentarism and naturally also within the People's Front those interests are differentiated fairly sharply. At several Council [meetings] we keep finding that within the same council there are conservatives represented as well as social democratic ideas...as people representing and expressing social-democratic ideas and groups [as heard] and so on. It would be fairly artificial to force upon the People's Front now a model of this kind so that the full complement would rename itself and start or become a social democratic party. Even if the electoral platform of the People's Front expresses the idea that, so to speak, the ideological axis of the electoral platform of the People's Front is associated with social democratic ideology, then the prognosis is such that it would be possible, taking into account the centrist nature of the People's Front, that a large section will join the Social Democratic Independence party, but at the same time it was not made to be more dominating, to dominate, so to speak. The way we see it—and I believe that this will become a reality already within the first months of the new year—[is that] the People's Front will transform into, well, a union of democratic parties or let us say, of parties which stay along democratic lines. The future Council of the People's Front—at least in the way I see it—would be an

assembly of representations of different parties, and those would then appear in the framework of a large democratic association. [passage omitted]

[Vihalemm] I think that we have bypassed the era of consolidation and that we have reached the era of coalitions, that is, an era in which unions based on a clearer self-definition will form coalitions. [passage omitted]

[Sinissaar] Very important, evidently, is also the relationship with the Communist Party and I would like to reintroduce this subject with an opinion from radio listener Koppel. He has opined: If the Communist Party is democratic like Veidemann said, then there is no point in founding all kinds of parties and movements for the sake of names. Let us be united and monolithic and follow Vaino Valjas' party.

[Veidemann] For a start, I never said that the Communist Party is democratic. The principle of centralism in it which has all the time kept us firmly tethered and in fact turned us into party soldiers—which has been extraordinarily degrading—this concept does not at all originate from the arsenal of democracy, so to speak. Apart from that, the monopoly position of the Communist Party in society—despite the recently appeared declarations to the effect that they lay no claim to this, and that is very nice. [changes thought] Then one would have to indeed recognize the fact that in a free competition between the parties they will receive the support which belong to them and which—on the basis of their program—they have offered to the people. I have not felt particularly sure about the Communist Party that all those promises which have been adopted up to now and which in fact—if we are now honest—are but following in the footsteps of what was [first] offered by the People's Front in respect of how Estonia is to progress.

I have no particular reason to feel sure that in the future, too, in this respect some kind of violence and so on will not await us. Because we can think now along the following lines—so far, so good. At the moment the idea is being instilled in me that the only body capable of protecting Estonia still from external despotism, say, and let us say, from Russian despotism, or let us call it Soviet imperialism, that that is the Communist Party which has a channel for dialogue with Moscow. But if we look back into the past, then through the selfsame channel the most fundamental repressions also took place. There was no protection of any kind. [passage omitted]

[Sinissaar] You have it written here, in your program thesis: At the same time we are of the opinion that the joining of present Communist Party member to the Social Democratic Independence Party can take place in a moral and trustworthy fashion only on the basis of personal selection and not through a collective decision. Such a selection presupposes uncompromising self-purging, giving up the Stalinist past and state socialism. A section of the people who have signed here are at the moment members of the Communist Party, Rein Veidemann, you, for example. How can this mechanism function in reality?

[Veidemann] Well, in principle, a decision has already matured within us as these theses appear and applications are already ready in writing. The issue is only to return this [Communist Party] membership card. This is the formal side, so to speak. But as I said, this schizophrenic state in fact has been reigning within me all along and within a few of my friends, too. I know that for certain. All along. That is, of this form, so to speak, and of the ideological content which we have been carrying within ourselves. Those are two completely different things. This cannot last any longer. [passage omitted]

[Parnoja] This decision in me, being a [Communist] Party member is completely clear also, so I do not feel guilty that at this particular moment I still carry the membership card on me. [passage omitted]

[Sinissaar] Let us also among other things talk about names a little. That is, I read here that included is, for example, Marju Lauristin [a leader of the People's Front] but I cannot see the name of Edgard Savisaar [another People's Front leader] here. Is it not the whole board of the People's Front behind this as one might conclude?

[Veidemann] Yes, I mean, indeed, it is not the whole Board of the People's Front behind it. If we now look at the manifesto of Estonian Free Democrats which appeared today then Heinz Valk of the Board of the People's Front [the only non-communist on the Board] has signed it. From the beginning as these ideas [of setting up the Social Democratic Independence Party] reached a stage of maturity, then purely pragmatically we tried to avoid ensuring that the Board of the People's Front would sign it. [passage omitted]

But this is a document which was born among those who share similar thoughts, with the basic text constantly having received additional thoughts, with different chapters...different people have tried to put together those chapters. All those undersigned have participated; it is a result of several debates and, I would say, brainstorms of a kind. [passage omitted]

[Sinissaar] This forum of yours will then take place on 11 and 12 January of next year, in Tartu. [passage omitted]

[Parnoja] There will be a whole string of speakers from abroad, from the Soviet Union, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, and also a discussion will take place on the second day. LIkewise, during the forum there will also be a discussion of the theses of the Social Democratic Independence Party, and one can foresee that a constituent assembly will be formed on the second day. [passage omitted on contact names and telephone numbers]

[Vihalemm] In respect of foreign speakers one could also say that we hope that some representatives of West German and Swedish social democratic parties will come here to speak of the new programs of their parties.

[passage omitted] Evidently there will also be representatives arriving from Austria and Great Britain.

[Parnoja] And from Finland, of course, too. [passage omitted, saying social democrats have not proved successful elsewhere but Veidemann thinks that in Estonia they will find their own way. Radio listeners worry if there are not too many parties already and no unity]

[Veidemann] Definitely, whenever action is needed, the People's Front will retain its unity and in this respect, well, this opposing force...we will always be able to mobilize the opposing force. Yet we basically want a parliament to govern here, which we will freely elect through the multi-party system, so that it expresses the interests of the whole of Estonia. [passage omitted]

[Sinissaar] Who will then represent our rights within the Communist Party of Estonia? This must not become solely a red party either. What can one think about it?

[Parnoja] Let us hope that there will be enough representatives also within it.

[Sinissaar] Like it should be in a normal society.

[Veidemann] Well, at present there are 110,000 members of the Communist Party [in Estonia]; of those 50,000 are Estonians. So perhaps those will suffice. [passage omitted]

Scientist Details Chernobyl's Consequences

LD2912171489 Moscow TASS in English 1618 GMT 29 Dec 89

[Text] Kiev December 29 TASS—By TASS correspondent Aleksey Petrunya:

Although the radiation contamination of districts affected by the 1986 accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station is lowering, an emotional tension among the population is growing. These two factors determined the statement at a news conference in Kiev by Anatoliy Romanenko, head of the All-Union Centre of Radiation Medicine of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences.

The scientist said that the opinion is now being formed about the catastrophic consequences of the accident for the life and health of thousands of people, particularly children.

Some blame on radiation all the symptoms of disease discovered by large-scale medical examinations. On this basis it is suggested that masses of the population be resettled.

Romanenko believes the resettlement will not alter the situation. It will only disrupt the organisation of medical observation and medical care.

The scientist said that due to a complex of measures to ensure radiation safety of the population, the average doses of iodine irradiation were decreased to one-third—one-fourth, and the doses of internal and external cesium irradiation were respectively decreased to one-tenth—one-twentieth and by half.

The study of medical and demographic processes in the region showed that the mortality rate in the surveyed districts did not alter significantly in the years following the accident. There were no changes either in the rate of congenital malformation.

Romenenko did not preclude the probability of radiation risk, expressing concern for the fate of children whose thyroid glands were subjected to iodine irradiation with the doses surpassing 200 rem.

The scientist said that the situation cannot be remedied by medical measures alone. There is a need for a complex of socio-economic measures. He said medics sent to the Ukrainian Government a package of proposals including benefits for those who suffered as a result of the accident, and their welfare.

Belorussian Front Leader Critical of State

90UN0517A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 24 Nov 89 p 4

[Report on interview with Yu.V. Khodyko, doctor of physico-mathematical sciences and supervisor of the optics laboratory of the Institute of Physics of the Belorussian SSR Academy of Sciences, and deputy chairman of the Soyma (soviet) of the Belorussian People's Front, by G. Olshak, SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA correspondent: "This Is Our Great Victory"; date and place not specified]

[Text] Minsk, and the last days of October. The Supreme Soviet of the republic is in session. Important questions are being decided: About the program for the elimination on the territory of Belorussia of the after effects of the accident at the Chernobyl AES [nuclear electric power station], and about the elections of people's deputies to the Supreme Soviet of the BSSR [Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic]. Heated debates, the likes of which Belorussia has not known, are going on in the House of Government on Lenin Square. One of the speakers at the session of the deputies characterized it as "a session of our conscience...." It is no less heated outside the walls of the House of Government. An unauthorized rally is being held on 25 October Square (more accurately, this was an attempt to hold a rally, because the militia had the last word). On the next day, modest and barely noticeable announcements again called on Minsk residents to a meeting on behalf of the Belorussian People's Front, which was scheduled for 1830 hours on the same square. And again the militia had the final word. The exit from the subway station to the square was closed, and it was blocked by buses. All streets leading into the square were blocked by the militia with motor vehicles. It turns out that it is easy to frustrate the schemes of the "shouters" and all kinds of "youths" there who desire to meet with deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the republic. They will keep them out, and that's that! And they did not let them

in—that was the order. Because the militia major condescendingly looked at the growing crowd—"most likely, you yourselves know why we do not let you in... And there is no need to pretend."

The people were getting irritated. Far from flattering words were heard concerning the leaders of the republic. The crowd increased, and traffic was stopped. And then USSR People's Deputy S. Shushkevich appeared from somewhere—he is the prorector of the Belorussian University, is well-respected in Minsk, and is participating in the work of the session: "Do not worry, those decisions will be made that the people need." It is surprising how several simple phrases addressed to people could cool heated passions. **In the morning, the newspapers reported that the rally, which was organized by the BNF [Belorussian People's Front] during work time (?), cost the city services administration R125,000. Participating in the rally were USSR People's Deputies S. Shushkevich, I.Ablameyko, and G. Yeremeyev. V. Mikhasev, chairman of the gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee], who demanded compensation for material damage... That was the situation in Minsk during my meeting with Yu.V. Khodyko, deputy chairman of of the Soym (soviet) of the Belorussian People's Front, doctor of physico-mathematical sciences, and supervisor of the optical laboratory of the Institute of Physics of the BSSR AN [Academy of Sciences].**

[Olshak] Yuriy Viktorovich, how could the city authorities calculate losses sustained by the stoppage of transport for a rather short time with such efficiency? Where did the figure of R125,000 come from?

[Khodyko] I do not know, and I cannot say. But to post several thousand militia employees on the square, and to partition off all nearby streets, apparently, costs a lot. And it was decided to put the blame on the participants of the rally.

[Olshak] Judging by everything, there is not the slightest mutual understanding between the Belorussian People's Front and the government of the republic...

[Khodyko] I believe that we hold very moderate democratic positions which, however, does not reconcile us with the authorities. It is not possible even to talk about some kind of mutual understanding. The registration of the BNF —a rather broad public movement—was postponed twice for the reason that the "BNF does not recognize the preeminent role of the CPSU." This is not entirely so. We do not reject the constitution of the USSR, which at the present time prescribes such a role for the party in our society. But we are demanding that a referendum be held on this question in the future, because the preeminent role of the party should not be fixed for it forever. It should be determined by specific deeds.

And although the authorities pretend that we do not exist, and they apply pressure and employ force, the authority of the BNF grows. While not long ago its ranks had 30,000 to 40,000 persons, it now has about 100,000 persons...

[Olshak] But the official authorities reproach the BNF to the effect that "hotheads" predominate among its supporters—the creative intelligentsia and students, but that the working class supposedly does not support you.

[Khodyka] This is a way, a kind of tactic, of accusing us of extremism. As for the working class, there is a struggle going on for it. The Worker Union of Belorussia came into existence—it is a socio-political organization which has as its purpose the protection of the rights of the workers and the resolution of social questions. It is not large at present, but is gaining more and more supporters. To counterbalance it, the Union of Worker Collectives of Belorussia, which is widely advertised in the mass media, was established. But from the very beginning, this was a stillborn child, because it was carried in high official circles. But the Worker Union is unpleasant for them, and it is disturbing to them, because it was given birth by life itself. We believe that this form of cooperation—the politicized People's Front and the Worker Union, which are trying to solve social problems, has promise.

[Olshak] Yuriy Viktorovich, let us recall the recent past. You were one of the organizers of the "Chernobyl high road"—a procession and rally of representatives of the area of Belorussia that sustained radiation. The repercussions of this measure was unexpected and loud: You were sentenced by a people's court to 2 months of corrective labor, and Gennadiy Grushevoy, the chairman of the "Children of Chernobyl" committee, was fined...

[Khodyko] Let us start with the fact that up until now neither the population of Belorussia nor of the country on the whole fully realize what a frightening misfortune struck our republic. It received two-thirds of the radioactive fallout. A number of rayons of the Gomel and Mogilev oblasts suffered particularly, and there are contaminated territories in the Brest and Mogilev oblasts. The government of the republic simply hid the truth from the people. According to the official conception, only 1,000 persons had to be resettled from the contaminated rayons. Of course, this was a premeditated lie.

According to the conception of the BSSR Academy of Sciences (and it was developed by our prominent scientists under the leadership of I. Lishtvan, the vice-president of the Academy of Sciences), more than a 100,000 persons will have to be resettled. And overall, more than a million people live in the contaminated territory, and this takes into account only the cesium readings and does not consider strontium and plutonium.

So that, the "Chernobyl high road" was conceived in order to bring these problems to the attention of the people, to the public at large of the republic. I took the application to conduct a procession, which was signed by

the leadership of the BNF, to the Presidium of the BSSR Supreme Soviet ahead of time. Finally—with delays—we were given an evasive reply: "We consider it inadvisable..." What was to be done. It was practically impossible to stop the measure to which people were invited from many rayons of the republic. Both the procession and the rally were held.

On 10 October, I was handed a summons: To appear in the rayon militia station. As a person who is disciplined, I went immediately: It does not matter why one is summoned. But at the militia station I was put in a car and taken to a people's court. Although I am not a lawyer, I collected my thoughts and came to the conclusion that I had the right to a lawyer and, therefore, I asked that the court proceeding be postponed for at least several days. As I found out afterwards, they arrested Gennadiy Grushevoy at home, took him to the militia station, drew up a protocol, and fined him in the sum of R300. They were stricter with me (as a malicious trespasser?). On 13 October, the court rendered a decision: 2 months of corrective labor, and withholding of 20 percent of salary. And, moreover, my behavior was scheduled to be investigated at a meeting of the labor collective... There was a paragraph in IZVESTIYA about all of these events, and I received numerous letters from throughout the country with expressions of support. True, one letter stated with a sense of satisfaction: It serves you right; you got what you deserve!

Naturally, I did not expect justice; it did not and does not exist. But another conclusion can be drawn: The government conducts a purposeful policy of repression against the BNF.

[Olshak] And you think that measures similar to the "Chernobyl high road," in spite of everything, will be of benefit, nonetheless?

[Khodyko] Undoubtedly, I believe that the session that is coming to an end adopted a realistic program to eliminate the aftereffects of the Chernobyl accident. To implement it will require about R17 billion. Of course, this is an enormous sum, but the health and the future of the Belorussian people are worth this.

[Olshak] During consideration of the draft laws on elections, critical discussions flared up around elections from public organizations and district meetings. The quota for public organizations, and especially for party organizations, was deemed by one of the speakers to be a necessary condition for democratic existence, because only representation of the Communist Party in the Supreme Soviet that is protected by law from the vagaries of a preelection campaign can prevent a political Chernobyl... What can you say about the laws that were adopted at the session?

[Khodyko] At the session, the deputies rejected attempts that were being made to foist official anti-democratic directions on them. Everyone elected by the people should represent all strata of the population in the elected organ of authority, and not only protect someone's corporate interests. And although the law was adopted half-heartedly at the session, a concession, so to speak, was made to the society of war and labor veterans, and the blind and the deaf, but this is still only 50 seats in the Supreme Soviet, and not the 120 seats that the supporters of quotas were trying to establish. I consider this to be the first victory of the Belorussian People's Front. I also spoke about this at the rally.

[Olshak] According to the well-known expression of Ales Adamovich, Belorussia has become the "Vendee of perestroyka." Perhaps this is stated a little too sharply, but, nonetheless, the facts compel one to think this. The informal organizations and movements, in fact, find themselves under a ban, all rallies and meetings are "unauthorized," the BNF congress was held in Lithuania, and its publications are printed there. Even after the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted amendments to the Constitution, which excluded elections from public organizations, this question was at the center of attention at the session in Minsk. Consequently, if not the "Vendee," then some kind of a "Belorussian phenomenon" does exist?

[Khodyko] For many years, Belorussia was spoken of unambiguously: It is developing dynamically and the well-being of the people is growing, in a word, it is almost an economic miracle. Actually, social relations in our country were healthier: There was no organized crime and no large-scale bribery, and if there was stealing, then it was little things.

But this was only a happy facade. A Potemkin village was being shown the world. Our intelligentsia, and along with it our national culture, was completely destroyed back in the 1930's. But how can a new one grow, when no roots remained, when the Belorussian language was on the verge of disappearing, and when our history was distorted, misinterpreted, and suppressed?

This probably can be explained to a certain extent by the state of public knowledge in Belorussia. Therefore, the BNF cannot now establish such large-scale tasks such as the people's fronts of the Baltics. Our main objective is to inspire public activity in the people. We have only to hope that with the passage of time a sense of national unity will arise like that which exists in the Baltic republics.

[Olshak] As a rule, politics is a matter for lawyers, economists, and historians. You are a representative of the exact sciences...

[Khodyko] I got into politics accidentally, and I was not on the committee for the creation of the People's Front. And although I am an optician, I am also intimate with humanitarians and representatives of the arts. A museum of ancient Belorussian art now functions in the Institute of Ethnography and Folklore of the BSSR Academy of Sciences. I took part in its creation. Starting in the 1960's, I rode around the republic, assembled exhibits for the museum, and preserved them from ruin

and destruction. I wrote a number of articles, including a chapter on easel painting, for the second volume of "The History of Belorussian Art...."

[Olshak] And the last question. Can a person, convicted by a people's court, be nominated as a candidate for people's deputy? Naturally, I have you in mind, Yuriy Viktorovich.

[Khodyko] Well, by that time my "term" will expire; consequently, I have the right. I have the modest experience of the preelection campaign: I was twice put on the ballot at district meetings, in two districts, in the last election campaign.

Archbishop Deplores Attempted Seizure of Church

PM2712142589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Dec 89 First Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Willful Actions"]

[Text] Kiev—A large group of Greek Catholics (Uniates) together with representatives of the so-called committee "For the Defense of the Ukrainian Catholic Church," with the support of members of several local informal organizations, has made an attempt to seize the Cathedral of the Holy Resurrection in Ivano-Frankovsk, which belongs to the Orthodox community. This church recently underwent major restoration funded by believers, the eparchy, and the personal savings of Archbishop Makariy of Ivano-Frankovsk and Kolomyya. Excited crowds, mostly women whom no one here had ever seen before, insulted Makariy and threatened him with reprisals as he was completing a religious service. Surrounding the church, they effectively made a hostage of the archbishop. He announced a hunger strike in protest.

"I am in favor of legality, not violence," the archbishop told a TASS correspondent. "The willful seizures of churches which have become more frequent in the West Ukraine recently sow enmity among the believers. These events, unless they are stopped, may ultimately lead to fratricide."

The hostile, violent actions, Archbishop Makariy noted, not only are not fitting for Christians, they shame the Catholic Church. The Orthodox Church does not want a second Ulster to emerge in the West Ukraine, does not want what is happening in Northern Ireland to happen here.

"All questions and disputes must be resolved constitutionally, on a legitimate basis," the archbishop stressed.

Delegates Speak at Leningrad Joint Plenum

90UN0419A Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 23 Nov 89 pp 2-5

[Report on delegates' speeches at joint plenum of Leningrad CPSU Obkom (oblast party committee) and Gorkom (city party committee): "For Socialist Ideas of Perestroyka"]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] **A.I. Aleksandrov, first secretary of the Moscow Raykom [Rayon Party Committee]:**

We have all condemned the desire from a time not so long ago to rush forward, to overestimate what had been achieved, and to adorn the existing reality with pretty phrases. This was the case, for example, with the age of developed socialism. In my opinion, however, this disease turned out to be chronic. In less than 5 years, we have managed to begin to accelerate, to enter upon perestroyka, and quite recently, to open a new stage—acceleration of perestroyka. All this occurred in the absence of any appreciable positive changes in the socioeconomic and spiritual life of the society. It would seem that the "deepening of perestroyka" proclaimed in the name of our program essentially has no deep internal content. On instructions from members of the Moscow Raykom, I suggest naming the document under discussion today more simply and clearly: the platform of Leningrad Communists under modern conditions.

My second proposal is to apply to the CPSU Central Committee for a mandatory expanded plenum of the party Central Committee on questions of intraparty life. If accepted, this appeal should be perceived not as one of the points of the platform but as a requirement of the oblast and city party committees, which is supported by the majority of Leningrad Communists. We already proposed this in April this year. In my opinion, however, the party Central Committee at this time does not have enough interest in studying the opinions of the masses of Communists. While previously they asked only for approval from below regarding decisions adopted by the Politburo or Central Committee, now they are not interested in anything. Isn't this why we, the first secretaries of the rayon and city party committees, have been waiting for months for the promised meeting with the general secretary?

We can still recall the dissatisfaction evoked by the elections of delegates to the 19th All-Union Party Conference, although they were conducted in keeping with the party regulations that were in effect. And here we are again asking the Central Committee to give us a democratic procedure for electing delegates to the 28th Congress. I consider it correct not to ask but to present a viewpoint that is broadly supported concerning conducting the elections at the next party congress according to party okrugs with a norm of representation approved by the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, by a direct secret vote from candidates nominated by the local party organizations of each okrug. The discussion of the candidacies could be conducted simultaneously with the development and consideration of various precongress platforms during the course of the intraparty discussion of the drafts of the new program and regulations.

With this plan for electing delegates, it seems expedient to conduct the report and election campaign in the party after the congress to make sure that all people who remain in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

meet the requirements of the new program and regulations. This approach, in my opinion, will remove the question of purging the party from the agenda and will make it consolidated and unified in its actions.

I must say something about the position held by the soviet of secretaries of party committees of our city's Association of Industrial Enterprises. The first and main thing, as they say in their address, is to hold a party conference with a democratic election of candidates. I think this is one more example of a disease that recently has infected our party organizations. We have all thrown ourselves into searching for new forms and methods. The more alternative candidacies there are in the elections, the more microphones there are in the hall or the meetings of various commissions and the higher the level of alleged party work. These are becoming our criteria.

With all this, we have too frequently begun to forget the goals of our work and the purpose of the political party in the society in general.

Today we have three goals: active participation in the elections of local soviets; preparation for the party congress; and, finally, through placement of Communists and their increased responsibility, imposition of order and discipline in production and in the society.

Today we must clearly state that it is not a matter of indifference to us which party the future people's deputies belong to.

I am sure that the oblast party organization is capable of nominating and offering to Leningraders many of their worthy representatives to soviets at all levels—not according to the "questionnaire system" and not from "nomenklatura lists" and not those who are always ready to justify the confidence placed in them. We must nominate people who can think, who are energetic, and who are principled.

Yes, many Communists today are being held back not by the fear of a more worthy opponent, but by a lack of desire to fight against the so-called "loud mouths" who have never taken responsibility for anything but are nonetheless always ready to fight for something.

This is why I consider it a matter of principle when there are no new laws concerning the status of deputies of local soviets or local self-management to adopt our party platforms for the forthcoming elections— platforms not in the form of slogans and appeals but mainly in the form of concrete deeds and solutions to various problems that have accumulated in each rayon. With this, we should establish our—party—authority and give our—party—guarantee that our promises will be kept. We can give these since in the labor collective councils, in the trade union committees, among the leaders, and finally among the current deputies, as of today, we Communists are the majority.

One last thing about combining the posts of first secretaries of the CPSU obkom and gorkom, I support this proposal as the only possible one in the specific situation, but during the course of the forthcoming report and election campaign in the oblast party organization we must, in my opinion, form a unified party committee.

D.N. Filippov, secretary of the [Leningrad] Obkom:

Everyone understands that it is impossible to live as we lived before, under the conditions of the administrative-command system, under the conditions of suppression of democracy and glasnost, and a voluntaristic approach to the economy.

Illegality, arbitrariness, and other dangers of the voluntaristic approach and other infringements on rights have disintegrated our society, created immense dissatisfaction, and generated evil. Therefore, the Leningraders heartily accepted the definition and search for ways out of the stagnant condition that had been created. All the Soviet people have suffered through perestroyka both in our society's political system and in the economy.

The task of the party and its Central Committee consisted in developing and arming perestroyka with a theory, determining the goals, and earmarking ways of achieving them. But, unfortunately, the party is not participating very well in the development of an integrated program. It is especially inadmissible that up until recently the Central Committee has not had a position regarding many of the most important problems. And this, in turn, leads to paradoxical situations. The USSR Supreme Soviet is considering laws on property, the socialist enterprise, and the press, and they are considering all viewpoints except one—the viewpoint of the leading party. However, the CPSU bears responsibility for today and for tomorrow.

Internal contradictions have grown stronger in the party. Examples of this are the reports in the press about Gdlyan, Ivanov, and Ligachev. There is a lack of definiteness about Yeltsin, incomplete statements, ambiguity, and from the center one cannot see any interest in rapidly straightening out these affairs and conflicts. There are various rumors and slander, which create a great deal of tension in the party and among the people. And only one thing is needed: the whole truth. These are the things that beat away at our authority.

The people justifiably express dissatisfaction with the way we are leading them. We are faced with crises, and they are expressed in the lack of balance in the monetary circulation, inflation, rising crime rates, a decline of morality, and aggravated national problems. Armed confrontation has developed in certain regions of the country. This is what makes it necessary for us to immediately determine our position—the position of a Communist.

The basic directions of our actions to bring the Leningrad region out of its difficult situation were presented in the program that was submitted and the report of B.V. Gidaspov, and I support them fully. I especially want to discuss the economy. It will largely determine the success

of perestroyka. In the initial period, attempts were made to create a mechanism whereby the party would get away from trivial affairs and playing the substitute for economic organs, and become the political leader in social development. This is correct. But, unfortunately, there was haste and a lack of foresight in the adoption of the fundamental laws of the economic mechanism such as those on the state enterprise, cooperation, taxation, not to mention the well-known ukase on the fight against drunkenness. Instead of carefully preparing and developing them in individual regions, we made the entire country a testing ground. We are feverishly looking for a way for the entire economy to get out of the crisis by the trial-and-error method. After destroying the old system, we have not created a new one.

And that is still not all. We have long been convinced that with respect to many positions the laws that were adopted have not only not helped but have even exacerbated the financial situation and our position in the domestic market and have led to the flourishing of the shadow economy and the loss of the reigns of control. Here are a couple of figures. For 1 ruble there are now 18 kopecks of commodity mass. The average monthly earnings have increased by a factor of 2.1 as compared to labor productivity. The availability of necessities is declining and the assortment of inexpensive goods is decreasing. This especially affects underprivileged pensioners and those who are living in blockaded areas. The situation continues to deteriorate.

The plan for next year is formed on the basis of the existing law on the state enterprise, which allows group egoism to run rampant everywhere, which leads to further deterioration of the already poor material support and a rupture of existing economic ties as well as a decline of contractual and labor discipline at the enterprises. As concerns the corrections made by the USSR Supreme Soviet to the law on cooperation, they in no way impede the continuing changing of money from noncash to cash or the drive for the overvalued and, to put it mildly, not always earned ruble, and the cooperatives are not placed in equal conditions with the state enterprises.

Labor turnover is increasing sharply in the labor collectives and the production volumes in physical indicators are decreasing. Society is being segmented. We are in favor of cooperation but against the kind that is a parasite on the state and the people and exacerbates an already poor situation on the commercial market.

It would seem that the decision to enlist the defense branches in increasing the output of consumer goods is correct, but the way this is actually being done could produce not an additional increase in goods but a collapse of the unique defense enterprises and their labor collectives which have been created with a great deal of effort. The main task of the conversion is to enlist science and transfer and introduce advanced technology for the output of consumer goods. It is necessary to dispel illusions of easy success among the population and tell the truth.

It is impossible for an enterprise that produces, for example, tanks to arrange for the production of either washing machines or refrigerators in a couple of days. This requires new technologies, retrained personnel, and additional capital investments and thus—time. Here, as in a number of other cases, first we are making a decision that is not fully considered and then looking to see what has come of it. Here we are faced with incomplete consideration and hasty work, and the workers are the ones who are suffering—mainly the working class.

In addition to all this, we in the local areas have taken a wait-and-see attitude, and the syndrome of passivity and irresponsibility has paralyzed many party committees and soviet and economic organs.

With a sigh of relief, many people perceived the separation of party and economic functions as a possibility of avoiding the most important problems of the economy. Organizational work was replaced by nothing but disputes. And the oblast party committee did not define its position with respect to many issues. Summing up, I suggest that the CPSU Central Committee revise its position toward a number of points of the law on enterprise.

Corrections were adopted at the meeting of the Supreme Soviet, which will help to improve certain things. However, it seems to me that in the situation that has been created priority should be given to strengthening planning discipline and adopting strict measures to prevent a decline in the standard of living of the population, especially in underprivileged families. At the enterprises, we must put an end to collective selfishness and arbitrariness and, at the same time, preserve and develop professional forms of labor organization which make it possible for a person to feel that he is in charge of production. In parallel, we must continue the development of the economic mechanism without repeating the mistakes we have already made. It is better to tell people the truth today and suggest some measures that may be severe and even unpopular or tomorrow we shall be faced with significantly greater losses, both economic and political. We must not sink into chaos. I give these assessments on the basis of opinions expressed at conferences of secretaries of party committees of enterprises of the defense industry and meetings of Communists of the largest party organizations.

Understandably, it is impossible to build a law-governed democratic state without political reform. Our party is a party of workers. And when speaking of common human values, which are undoubtedly valid, it seems to me that we are beginning to forget about class interests. During the course of perestroyka, we should have taken into account the distribution of class forces and their ratios. The working class and the peasantry must be at the center of revolutionary transformations. They are the

ones who largely determine the successes of perestroyka and must participate actively in the leadership of the party and the country. Representatives of other social segments frequently try to represent the interests of the working class, but in this role nobody can replace them.

The workers therefore are resorting to extreme measures to protect their interests. In certain regions, parallel party and soviet structures are already being created for the purpose of guiding these processes of their self-expression—such as the worker strike committees.

It will be especially dangerous if we allow a reduction of the representation of the working class and the peasantry in the local soviets.

The main task of the present day for party committees and all Communists of the city and oblast is to ensure that the best representatives of the workers and peasants are elected to these organs.

The country is beginning to discuss the draft law on property, a cornerstone law which will determine the further development of our society. The main thing around which debates are revolving in the USSR Supreme Soviet is the attitude toward private property. Here again, we must first ask the working man, the working class, and the peasantry: Who needs this—the workers of the Kirov Plant or bolshevik, who live from hand to mouth or the wheeler-dealers of the shadow economy, who wish not only to realize their largely unearned incomes but also to become the true masters in our economy?

Certain forces would like to eliminate the party from the arena of political influence—the party, the body which expresses the interests of the worker, mainly the working class. The fulfillment of the intentions of these forces, in my view, would mean an interruption of the processes of restoration occurring under the banner of perestroyka.

There is no returning to the old days, and that is the truth. Then we had Stalinism, then we had stagnation, but we must go forward with a clear course in mind. Therefore, I suggest convening an expanded plenum of the party Central Committee before the Second USSR Congress of People's Deputies, at which we could discuss questions of immediate measures for stabilizing the sociopolitical situation in the country as well as the situation in the ideological, economic, and social spheres, and also measures for normalizing life within the party and overcoming the crisis phenomena that exist.

It would be right for certain members of the Politburo, for example, Comrades A.N. Yakovlev and V.A. Medvedev, to tell us what way they see out of the condition of crisis in ideological work and what contribution we are making at the present time to the development of the international communist and worker movement.

In spite of the immense difficulties, we are convinced that we will find our way out of the situation that has been created, and the guarantee of this is a high level of awareness of our workers and above all the working class.

Although there are immense difficulties with material and technical supply and interruptions in the operation of transportation, the majority of labor collectives still intend to complete the 4 years of the five-year plan successfully. The main thing today is to concentrate on work and not to allow panic and ill-considered actions, to achieve good labor organization and discipline, and to balance next year's plan. We must also create the appropriate mood for concrete deeds. **V.M. Nelyubov, first secretary of the Lomonosovskiy Raykom:**

When discussing the program of the Leningrad party organization, it should be noted that this document is directed not only to Communists but to all Leningraders. This places on all of us a special responsibility for the fate of almost 7 million residents of Leningrad and the oblast. Therefore, I suggest accepting this document as a platform for the actions of the Leningrad party organization and continuing to work on it, strengthening a specific direction, taking into account the preparations for the report and election party conference and the 28th Party Congress.

The party is an integrating, uniting force in Soviet society. To achieve really solid success and retain the role of the political vanguard under the new conditions ,the party must restructure itself more rapidly than the society.

Since the 19th Party Conference at which many problems of life within the party were pointedly raised, we have emphasized the need to bring our ideological and political values in line with reality. The Central Committee, the Politburo, and the Secretariat have clearly slackened up on their work in this area. Many ideological and political goals sound like nothing more than words and are not supported by corresponding documents. To this day, we do not have clear positions regarding a whole number of issues. In essence, as before, frequently we have only a speech of one party official or another for orientation.

Every day we are feeling what the wait-and-see attitude on the part of party organizations and also the Central Committee leads to. The decree of the joint plenum of the CPSU obkom and gorkom in April included a proposal addressed to the Central Committee to hold a plenum about life within the party. This wish was also expressed at meetings with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Vitaliy Ivanovich Vorotnikov here in Leningrad. But up until now, the Leningrad Communists have not received a concrete response to their proposal, even though we can see that the situation has become much more complicated both in the party and in the society during this year and a half. Therefore, I support the proposal of Comrades Aleksandrov and Filippov for our joint plenum once again to address the Central Committee about holding in the near future, before the

opening of the Second Congress of People's Deputies, an expanded plenum of the Central Committee at which they would discuss the situation in the party and in the society.

Now about Article 6 of the USSR Constitution: I do not agree with the rendition included in the latest variant of the program. Should we remove Article 6? This must be decided by the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. However, it will no longer do for Communists to remain silent about their attitude toward this problem.

Undoubtedly, the party should show its leading role in the society not with an entry in the Constitution but with concrete deeds.

At the same time, in today's situation, we see how certain zealots for "democracy" under the guise of excluding Article 6 from the USSR Constitution are demanding the elimination of the CPSU as a real political force altogether. At the same time, they are actively promoting their own representatives as possible candidate people's deputies of the RSFSR and local soviets.

For example, we have in the rayon the Koporye Sovkhoz [state farm] which is in a remote area, and some voyagers came out here to offer their candidacy so that they might be elected from this okrug to the oblast soviet of people's deputies. In return, they promised a significant amount of money and a number of other services. The local residents showed them the door. It is quite clear, however, that these people will stop at no means or methods to achieve their goals, thus showing their true faces. I think that if certain visitors have already compromised their conscience for money, at least let them not hope that real Communists will do the same thing.

During the course of the discussion of the program, many proposals were expressed regarding bringing the structure of the oblast and city party committees to their optimal variant. The eradication of departmental prejudices must begin with the party structures. Separation of the party from the city exists in many spheres of life of the Leningrad region and it does not contribute to consolidation of our forces in solving urgent problems.

I think many social problems, especially those that are common to the city and the oblast, can be solved more efficiently and permanently if the posts of first secretaries of the party obkom and gorkom are combined. This would make it possible, in my opinion, to eliminate parallelism and duplication in the work of the oblast and city party committees, and it would give the soviets, both oblast and city, more enthusiasm, especially on the eve of the elections.

Only we must make sure that with this combination of poses the people will feel palpable results and concrete solutions. Then Leningraders will perceive this combination not as another camouflage in the work of party organs but as our practical possibility of exerting a stronger influence on the implementation of what is intended for Leningrad and the oblast—as was already said, a unified complex. Therefore, it should develop comprehensively and not to the detriment of one part or another. While I support Comrade Yarov's speech, today I should like to discuss protection of the interests of agricultural workers.

I am not speaking about global problems where the departments continue to overwhelm the rural areas with inflated prices for technical equipment and other means of production, which the sovkhozes are unable to pay, and place them in unequal partnership relations, which significantly complicates the solutions to all social problems in the rural areas. I understand that not everything depends on the party obkom and gorkom. There are also problems which we can and should solve here in Leningrad and the oblast. But again, we are held back by the notorious departmental interests and the separation of city and oblast services of the Leningrad oblast and city soviets of people's deputies. People are speaking about this openly, with a great deal of alarm and pain. They sometimes reproach us for our powerlessness and bureaucratism. Thus, we are losing the mandate of our constituents on the eve of the elections. We Communists do not have the right to allow this. We must act.

N.N. Korablev, first secretary of the Vasileostrovskiy Raykom:

First of all, I want to express my complete agreement with the assessments of the condition of our society that were heard in the report today. This is a situation which dictates the need for the most rapid adoption of the concrete program of actions, whose draft we are considering. It presents fairly clearly the positions regarding the main issues in the life of our society and party. The program, however, is not without shortcomings.

From my viewpoint, the new redaction of the section on intraparty democracy has practically not changed for the better. Numerous interesting and constructive proposals, which were published in the press and expressed during the course of the discussion of the draft program by Communists of local party organizations, including the proposals of the Vasileostrovskiy residents, were not reflected in the redaction under discussion today. Many of the points are merely declarative, they do not bind anybody to anything, and they cannot unite the rank-and-file party members in their desire, through democratic transformations of the CPSU itself, to breathe new life into the socialist restructuring of Soviet society. It is difficult to speak about party democracy without significantly increasing the rights of the foundation of the CPSU—the local party organizations. The time of restructuring from above has receded permanently into the past, and it is impossible to restructure from below without the rights to do so.

I think that under modern conditions the Leninist production-territorial principle for structuring the party is also in need of protection since doubts about the expediency of retaining this structure have been expressed repeatedly in both the central and Leningrad mass

media. The attitude of Leningrad Communists toward this principle should be given an unambiguous interpretation in our program of actions.

At the present time in the press and in the speeches of many orators, including certain people's deputies, there has been sharp criticism of the basis of the economic system of socialism and public and, above all, national ownership of the means of production. Proposals are being made to turn a considerable share of the means of production, including land, over to collective and private ownership, that is, to take the path of denationalization. The realization of these proposals could prove fatal for socialism in the USSR.

But their proponents, without paying attention to the opinion of specialists on problems of property, are actively forming public opinion in the corresponding way.

This issue was reflected in the suggestions from the Vasileostrovskiy Rayon party organization for the draft of the program of actions for Leningrad Communists. I think it is fundamental, and therefore necessary, to determine our common position regarding this issue.

Now about combining the posts of first secretaries of the CPSU obkom and gorkom. I am in favor of this step. I think this should be done right now so they can gain a certain amount of experience in joint operations of the obkom and gorkom and their apparatus before the report and election campaign and to develop an optimal structure. And the final decision about how the Leningrad party committee should be made at the report and election conferences.

I must say that the program we are discussing today has already played a positive role. For the first time in recent years local party organizations have begun to participate in a concrete cause directed toward searching for a way out of the impasse. The people have seen that the manifestations of stagnation in the party are unacceptable not only to the rank and file of the CPSU, but also to the oblast and city party committees. And they have given us hope.

This is even more important since many Communists understand quite well that today the Central Committee does not have a clearcut position regarding many vitally important issues both in the CPSU itself and in the country as a whole. The decisions of the 27th congress have been shelved. Many of them are being revised by party organizations of the union republics. And the defamation of socialist ideals and party organs is not occurring somewhere in the corridors, but is pouring out in a broad stream through the mass media.

It is obvious that people are openly trying to deprive the party of its leading position in society, that is, there is a real political struggle for power in progress. Therefore, our Communists saw in their attempt to create their program the desire of the Leningrad CPSU obkom and gorkom to act, and to act decisively.

But what kind of action can there be if we are unable to realize the very fundamental points of our program pertaining to political and intraparty issues, since they fall within the competence of the Central Committee, and many of them are within the competence of the party congress as well. It turns out that we are postponing our actions until October 1990. Is this what the Leningrad party organizations are expecting of us? I think not.

The Vasileostrovskiy Party Raykom and many local party organizations of the rayon are very disturbed by the growing crisis in the CPSU and the indecisiveness of the members of our party Central Committee, which has thinned out considerably since the 27th congress. And yet today as never before we need resolute actions for evaluating the political situation in the country and the state of affairs in the party and developing a concrete program of actions under modern conditions, for the entire party needs this program today.

I emphasize that this program can be adopted only by the congress, and to wait for it for a year would be tantamount to inaction. Therefore, many Communists of the rayon and members of the Vasileostrovskiy Party Raykom voted in favor of convening an extraordinary party congress. I ask you to consider our proposal.

We are aware of all the difficulties along this path and how busy the near future will be with events, but we also understand something else: inaction is like death.

But it would be incorrect to concentrate all our attention only on the extraordinary congress. Now as never before we need a self-sacrificing struggle by each of us and all of us together against any manifestations of extremism and attempts to lead us off the socialist path of development. In this regard I suggest instructing the Presidium to prepare a text of an appeal of the CPSU obkom and gorkom to Leningraders which would give an evaluation of the situation that has developed in the party and the country and calling for Communists and nonparty members to consolidate their forces in the struggle for party renewal and the imposition of order and the strengthening of discipline everywhere. [passage omitted]

Yu.A. Denisov, secretary of the [Leningrad] Obkom

We have already become accustomed to the idea that there is a real struggle for political power in society. But perhaps until the recent discussions that have developed in the Supreme Soviet and the country it was difficult to determine the path of the line that separates the battling forces, since in general everyone was speaking in the slogans of perestroyka, democratizations, and glasnost. And I assume that the discussion that has developed today around the problem of private property, which has been mentioned repeatedly today, is a touchstone that will enable us today to determine the political faces of the battling forces. But, unfortunately, so far neither we nor the party Central Committee yet considers it possible to make a statement regarding this key and pivotal

issue. And I think that here, having formed our unambiguous position, we must express our request or instruction to the members of the party Central Committee from the Leningrad party organization and bring our viewpoint to the next plenum of the Central Committee which, I assume, should take place before the Second Congress of People's Deputies.

Here even in the report there was a clear formulation of the idea of who could acquire means of production as private property. The party must not remain silent under these conditions, and it must clearly formulate its position with respect to this issue or convince the workers that the place for wheeler-dealers of the shadow economy is in the vanguard of perestroyka and not behind bars.

This is not an idle issue. Let us look at its cross section. Today we are entering the election campaign. The nomination of candidate deputies will begin on 4 December. For the first time, perhaps, this election campaign will take place under conditions of the actual existence of more than one party. And not because we have so many of all kinds of informal associations, and we do have dozens of them, but because a watershed has appeared which actually separates the opposing forces. This watershed passes between two essential slogans. Our slogan, as you have already heard, is "All who are for socialism and a socialist renewal of the economy are with us." We are opposed by the slogan which was formulated most crudely and clearly by the column of so-called "democratic" forces at the demonstration on 7 November: "Let us deal a blow to communism with perestroyka!"

Who embodies today, not in theoretical constructs but in reality, these forces which are lusting for power in order to turn back our society's development or, as they now say, turn it "forward to capitalism"? It is not so simple to define them, although it seems that quite specific organizations are coming to the fore.

I think that everything that has been happening in recent days gives us the right to say that these forces are being consolidated around the People's Front, under its slogans, and it is the unifying force. And here we, too, must formulate our position with respect to the People's Front and its leadership in the full sense of the word. Since both in the People's Front and among the anarchists and anarcho-syndicalists of the most diverse organizations there are a mass of people who have sincerely come here in search of answers to questions that are bothering everyone. And particularly in the People's Front there are many people—I know many of them personally—who still think that the slogans of the People's Front are democracy and glasnost and their all-around development. I think we must publicly and openly extend a hand to them and show them that we are with everyone, regardless of membership in various organizations, who takes as his point of reference the socialist renewal of the society. Concerning the People's Front's devotion to democracy, this is no longer even funny, as they say. Here is an example I can give from my own experience of recent months. There was a combined plenum of creative unions. It was an excellent plenum which proposed adopting excellent decisions, but it just so happened that by the end of it barely one-fifth of the participants were still in the hall. And the united board of creative unions itself decided to postpone the voting on the main resolutions. And who insisted on voting in spite of all the principles of democracy? That same Degtyarev, that same Bogomolov, and other People's Front leaders like them. Literally foaming at the mouth they demanded: "No, let us vote." Why? Because one of the resolutions on which they had to vote was the relationship to the production districts. Regardless of how we may feel about them (our attitude is formulated in the report here), the approach of the People's Front activists to this problem is simple—trample them down, do not let the initiators of this idea raise their heads. And the methods that were used were like something out of the arsenal of lobbyists in U.S. political life. The thousands of telegrams that were sent to the Supreme Soviet are clear evidence of this and an indicator. Therefore, today we have every justification taken from the practice of political life to formulate our own position here and begin to make it a reality. All we must do is work out the words and sentences. It is time that we understood that this is either a fight for the essential interests of the workers or for a possible radical turn in our development, in a direction away from the socialist path.

The next point I would like to discuss is the fact that in this struggle we, of course, can rely only on a renewed party. The proposals that were formulated in our platform need, perhaps, to be augmented, but I think that the process of renewal of the life of party organizations can and should proceed on the basis of them. The impetus for this process in the partywide sense must be given by the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, and we must categorically insist that it be held before the Second Congress of People's Deputies. I join in on the demand that certain members of the Politburo and the party leadership report on their actions and statements because this is a turning point and we must not remain silent here. We must not only take our position before the Leningrad Communists and the citizens of Leningrad, but also demand that the party Central Committee take a clearcut position. Why am I in favor of a plenum and not the congress? Key problems have come to a head, especially having to do with what our party should be—a federation of republic party organizations into which we are being forced by our comrades from the Baltic states or a unified party which can be only the CPSU resting on a unified Program and Regulations. I think and I am convinced that the congress can be a turning point only if we prepare for it ideologically and organizationally, after extensive discussion about the platform and after clear formulation requirements of an organizational nature. Otherwise, it will cause a serious schism in the party. If it is conducted in parallel with the elections to republic and local soviets it could essentially become the congress of our party's collapse. Therefore we carry a great deal of responsibility on our shoulders.

And the last thing I would like to discuss.

Today we are all disturbed not only by the destiny of the party, perestroyka, and socialism, but also by a problem that is very concretely and closely linked to all of these others—the problem of the restoration both of Russia and of Leningrad as the largest city in the country. As Boris Veniaminovich once said, Leningrad is not the capital, but it is not the country's second city either. I consider this a correct slogan, around which we can rally the Leningraders. And the recent combined plenum of creative unions advanced the idea of the restoration of Leningrad as the center of culture. We must give a powerful impetus to the development of Leningrad's culture.

Speaking at this combined plenum, I said that I do not share the position of those organizers who failed to invite two of our most important creative unions: These are the Association of Directors and the United Labor Collective Council who have funds which they can invest in the development of Leningrad, including in the development of its culture. By uniting the efforts both of the creative intelligentsia and the party organization and also our labor collectives, we can really take a step forward.

In conclusion, I would like to say that we have become accustomed to sitting it out in the trenches. A recent rally held by Vasileostrovskiy residents showed that we are actually very much in command of the devices of this form of democratic discussion, polemics, and political struggle. We have a great deal to learn, but we can and should also do something. I wish to support the initiative of a number of party organizations who have brought this up and suggest that we all gather at a city-wide rally and show our organization, power, and support for the socialist orientation of perestroyka. I think this would be correctly understood both by Communists and by Leningraders.

G.S. Khizha, general director of the Svetlana Electronic Instrument Building Association

In the platform for the Leningrad party organization for deepening perestroyka, which we are considering today, unfortunately, an unjustifiably small amount of space has been devoted to questions of the economic reform which, in my opinion, is quite inadmissible.

Economic successes and the economic reform today are the point of the entire economic reform. Unfortunately, the document gives neither an evaluation of the program for economic reform proposed by the government nor its own position.

And what is said in point 1 of the section on the socioeconomic policy is simply a slogan, and the paths to its realization were neither clear nor did they become clearer.

Recently it has become almost generally accepted to criticize state property, viewing state enterprises as the embodiment of economic backwardness and political conservatism.

Comrade Bunich in an interview in ARGUMENTY I FAKTY has already announced that "State property is dead... The only thing it is capable of is being looted."

I shall have more to say about this call for looting. But for now I shall speak about state enterprises. Any economic structure can work more effectively or be less dependent on the economic environment in which it operates. There is no point in discussing the economic environment in which we operated up until 1985. But even during the period of perestroyka we have made basic economic mistakes and adopted half-measures, questionable decisions which exacerbated the position of state enterprises and also the economy as a whole.

An unprejudiced analysis shows that state enterprises, especially large enterprises, have ended up among those that have gained the least and lost the most from the economic transformations being conducted in the country. And yet the fate of the state enterprises under the conditions of economic reform is the fate of the economic reform itself. Mistakes here cost far too much. It is unacceptable to take a path which for the benefit of the new forms undermines and impedes the possibilities for existing economic forms to work effectively. This is, of course, effective for proof of the need for changes, but quite uneconomical.

While in no way underestimating the significance of the steps of the economic reform related to improving forms of ownership, I am convinced that the ceiling on the effectiveness of state enterprises is fairly high and has not yet been reached. And therefore it would be reasonable now to do this: Take absolutely necessary measures that would make it possible for existing economic systems to operate with maximum effectiveness, since today they are the only ones capable of improving the situation in the near future. Naturally, these measures should not go against the basic directions of the reform, and in parallel, like a swelling wave, measures should be taken for the development of new forms of management.

But while introducing new forms of property we must first develop social, economic, and legal mechanisms for regulating and realizing them. We must not allow for the laws to be declared first and then start thinking about the mechanisms, as was the case in the West with cooperation. If we do, this will indeed lead to a looting of state property.

I am convinced that the success of the most revolutionary economic transformations can be achieved only with a smooth transition while maintaining the stability of the administration at large state enterprises.

In our opinion, this should be regarded as a political imperative, the violation of which will not only deal a

blow to the state enterprises themselves but also inevitably halt the reform altogether.

In what directions should state enterprises develop?

First. Workers in state enterprises must be paid for their labor according to its results.

And I am disturbed by these endless discussions of the idea that the amount of unearned money we receive is more than the products we produce.

I think that any businessman with a sound mind who is sitting here will understand that we are receiving wages at a maximum coefficient of 0.3 in relation to the increase in the production volume, and we receive material incentive funds which comprise only a small part of the resources that are saved from the reduction of the cost of producing the products. This is earned money, and I can stand here and tell you that straight out.

Dozens of remaining restrictions and bans in the sphere of state property stand in the way of our receiving wages. State enterprises—the leading ones above all and not just the backward ones and those operating at a loss—need real rights, real economic accountability, and fair normatives and taxes that make it possible to develop production and the social sphere normally and receive pay for their labor and the products that are produced. This is the only thing that will produce a powerful impetus in the economy today.

These rights should pertain above all to the principle of construction of a wage system, the policy for distributing the enterprise's income, and the possibilities of using the money it earns. No less important is the right of the labor collectives to regulate their own labor relations.

These are immediate measures which must be reflected in the unified law on the socialist enterprise for all forms of property without the loopholes of the law on cooperation, which should be eliminated. Subjects with rights and subjects without rights cannot operate at the same time in an economy. In such a situation rights are the same thing as privileges that bring large incomes. And we should not act as though we do not understand all this.

We must immediately close off channels for obtaining unearned money for which there are no products in all areas of the economy.

Second. We see the further development of state enterprises in the immediate introduction of joint stock property and the creation of state joint-stock enterprises. It is joint stocks acquired by workers of the enterprises that will create in them a real interest, not only in increasing incomes but also in increasing the property of the enterprise itself and will sharply increase responsibility. This would provide an opportunity for workers to invest their savings in stocks and obtain much more income from them than they obtain in savings banks. The property of enterprises as it exists today cannot be purchased in the form of shares by the collective and must be granted through an indefinite loan. In general, the buying up of enterprises by workers seems somewhat absurd to me because I cannot understand from whom we are supposed to buy them if they already belong to us.

And if one takes into account the amounts of deductions into the budget, one might say that we bought them long ago. And as far as personal money goes, I do not think that any of us working in the state economy have any. There is money in the shadow economy and in cooperation. But, in my opinion, these are not the right buyers for state property.

Taking all this into account, the categorical slogan that has been advanced recently concerning state denationalization of a considerable share of the enterprises, and accelerated at that, especially against the background of statements to the effect that state property is only there to be stolen, seems hysterical and evokes misgivings.

We cannot allow this "state denationalization" to be transformed into theft and pilferage by individuals who did not participate in its creation. And we can observe this today. The categorical imposition of forms of management and their names are also quite surprising. What is leasing? Why do we need this new word which seems to imply some kind of panacea? We do not need questionable leasing but rights, and not for enterprises that are operating at a loss but for everyone, and not some day in the future but now, the sooner the better.

The general development of state property should be its transition to collective property on the basis of joint stocks owned by members of the labor collective. The state joint stock enterprise combines world economic experience and the economic realities of our economy.

But the changeover of state property to indivisible property of the labor collective, which some people are proposing today, along with deepening the idea of production self-management, will lead the economy into the impasse of an irreversible crisis.

The so-called "radically moderate variant" of the strategy of economic reform that is being proposed by the government amounts to a policy of controlled inflation. Yet with the low level of organization of control of the course of the reform that we are observing now, the increased social tension, and the growth of other negative phenomena, this variant seems utopian and can easily be transformed into a radical one with all the consequences of complete disorder of the monetary system, galloping inflation over a long period of time, the destruction of a large number of enterprises, a significant drop in the standard of living of the workers, and differentiation of various population groups according to incomes and material provision.

Unless we take serious measures to improve control of the economic reform, we must be prepared for this.

The proposed tax system again is oriented toward taxation of corporate bodies and not physical persons. There

is no tax system for personal incomes. There never has been such a system and we do not have one now. And this is with orientation toward the development of the market and various forms of property.

This defect in our system has already led to a situation where, imposing taxes on enterprises and not on the incomes of citizens, we have arrived at a point of great differentiation of incomes and accumulations, which in turn has generated the shadow economy which, as distinct from the official one, is not taxed at all and has increased personal wealth, which cannot be considered legal since it has bypassed the taxes.

The current practice of developing cooperation has exacerbated this situation. Through the efforts of the mass media all this has become a subject of discussion among the broad masses of workers. The social injustice that has developed over the 72 years of the existence of Soviet power has become an exposed nerve causing constant irritation of people, which is being observed today in the collectives of enterprises.

In the current situation this is the main obstacle, in our view, a stumbling stone on the path to the development of the economic reform, and it must be removed.

And, finally, about the mechanism for preparing for and the technology for adopting economic decisions and laws with an evaluation of their social and economic consequences. This mechanism should be representative, public, and more responsible. It seems that forces that do not defend the interests of the workers but the interests of the shadow economy have access to the solutions to these problems now. Today it is not the government that should help us, but we who should help the government.

The associations of state enterprises that have been created today throughout the entire union as socioeconomic organizations, such as the Leningrad association of state enterprises, can take charge of a considerable share of these problems, making things easier for the government.

I ask the oblast and city committees to support the proposed position and assist in its realization.

Before I leave the podium, since I have had sad experiences, speaking both at the obkom plenum and in other forums, if the materials of the plenum are published I ask that measures be taken so that the editors of our LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA do not distort not only the form, but also the meaning of the speeches, something that has been done repeatedly.

A.I. Serebyannikov, director of the Rassvet Sovkhoz in Luzhskiy Rayon

We meet with the city and oblast party committees again and again to resolve important issues. But the issues today must all be important and mutually important, and therefore we must always work together and be of one mind.

Today we discussed the question: To be or not to be? My opinion is that the person on top today is the one in charge of the processes of perestroyka. The party must immediately take over the press, radio, and television, which were turned over to it at one time, for otherwise the ordinary inhabitant will take the distortions of the press as reality.

The draft of the program of action for the Leningrad party organization in the area of socioeconomic policy regarding providing the population of the Leningrad region with food contains a solution to rural problems as well. I wish to focus attention on this. A large potential has been created in agriculture in Leningrad Oblast, and it is constantly gathering force directed toward implementing the food program in our region. This potential includes fattening complexes, poultry industry enterprises, hog industry enterprises, and vegetable farms, and it would be a shame if we were to spoil all this.

Today the plan is not backed up by resources, and as a result the output of animal husbandry and crop growing products is decreasing, and the problem of prices for agricultural products has not been solved. Moreover, industrial prices for mixed feed, technical equipment, fertilizers, construction materials, and fuel for agriculture are increasing at catastrophic rates. The production cost of our products is also increasing. During the past 3 years material expenditures on their production have increased by 25 percent. The rural areas have been placed in conditions whereby we cannot keep above-plan products and send them to our rayon. For the plan for products which we sell to the state we receive a subsidy, and above-plan products left in the rayon are paid for from the local budget, which today is negative. So it turns out that above-plan products are produced at a loss. Above-plan crop growing products sometimes do not depend on the agricultural worker. Sometimes the procurement bases will not accept these products. These include potatoes and vegetables. At the same time, there is a shortage of these products in the stores and they are purchased on the outside, as is now being done: For example, cabbage is being shipped in from Moscow.

We grow products only for the city of Leningrad and we keep for ourselves only about 1 percent of the potatoes and 1 percent of the meat, and all the rest goes to Leningrad. Therefore, planting, harvesting, and storing it are a task we have in common with Leningraders. But we do not need your hands or the hands of the women they send to our farms; we need the minds of scientists or the technical equipment that should be produced by the military and industrial complexes, but not at the cost of a "Buran" but a little cheaper.

An example was provided by the Baltic Sea Shipping Line: Three people plant and harvest 150 hectares of potatoes. Where is there such a thing in Leningrad Oblast? Nowhere so far. So this is something for us to strive for. Leningrad's procurement base is an intermediate stage between the producer and the consumer. The products only spoil here both during delivery and during

storage, and this year we had to add during the loading of the railroad cars. Therefore, in order for the products to be of high quality they must be stored where they are produced and shipped to the consumers at contractual prices as they are needed. To do this it is necessary to increase budget funds for the construction of modern storage facilities in the rural areas, enlisting the industrial enterprises. Then there will be no need for Leningraders to work all winter at the bases in order to pick through the spoiled products. It is also necessary to solve problems of processing products in rural areas. Today it is more advantageous for us to ship products to Leningrad to the meat combine than to sell them in our rayon because we do not have good technology. And this is a difference of 160 kilometers!

The construction of processing enterprises in rural areas is still going through trials and tribulations. In conjunction with the rayon consumers' union, we have constructed a shop for stewing meat. We have meat, spices, and lids, but no containers. We want stewed meat but cannot try it. And no one will be able to solve this problem before the new year.

In 1990 we will construct a meat combine, and the purpose of this construction is to process right on the farm all the products we produce on the farm. (Next year we will produce 5,800 tons of meat in live weight). It is no secret to anyone that a large quantity of meat is lost on the way from the producer to the consumer. There was a good discussion of this in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in an article entitled "Confessions of a Storeman." Leningrad meat combines slaughter a large number of head of livestock, and there are also such subproducts as tongues, scraps, and livers which one never sees for sale. Our farm's collective has a large request: Let us not forget future generations.

We have a suggestion for implementing the food program: Obligate all sovkhozes (although "obligate" is a strong word, it is probably the one to use) to allot neglected plots to all who wish to acquire them. On our sovkhoz we have 678 plots and buildings, of which 405 are suburban. That is 60 percent. And we have nothing against that. That is very good. The buildings have been transformed and flowers have appeared in the yards, and there are additional products which feed the families who grow them, and there are some left for sale to their neighbors.

And the small villages are no longer dying out here. As concerns property, let us solve that problem locally. All forms are good, but they cannot be imposed on people in any case.

Now about cooperatives, especially ones that speculate. It makes your skin crawl! Today these speculating cooperatives are determining the policy. And sometimes we hear various complaints against the party, but 80 percent of the dissatisfaction is because of these cooperatives. Because we have opened them and permitted them. We must close them down and that is all there is to it. Otherwise, as they say, either we shall have to put them in jail or we shall have to go.

And the last thing. We must stop saying "Power to the soviets!" We have been saying this for probably more than 70 years and the soviets still do not have any power. I think we should give it quickly, but the soviets are afraid to accept it because today we have no good cadres. And I think we should try to solve the problem by following the example of our local soviet—our sovkhoz and soviet have various kinds of territory and we give them everything: forests, lakes, minerals, and we shall keep all the money from them in our local budget. Just so long as nobody interferes with us in our legitimate activities. And then we shall pass on our experience.

In conclusion I would like to say that we approve of the program of action for the Leningrad party organization for deepening perestroyka. **V.Ya. Khodyrev, chairman of the Leningrad City Executive Committee [gorispolkom]**

The draft of the program that was worked out through the collective efforts of the Leningraders has become a goal-oriented and weighty document which places specific focuses on many problems troubling the residents of our city. I consider it possible to arm ourselves with this program as a guide to action. And in general I wish to say that the very fact of the appearance of this document and that it was developed under conditions of extensive discussion and openness in and of themselves constitute a fairly large step in restructuring the activity of the Leningrad party organization.

Above I deliberately spoke about Leningraders and not about communists because I am convinced that the program of the Leningrad Communists will be successful only if it is supported by each Leningrad family, each resident of our city, regardless of age or rank. I think the document should clearly and concisely state not only the means but above all the goal of the program. Why have we undertaken perestroyka today? Probably in order to make our common socialist home worthy of human life so that each and every one of us will feel like a human being in it. And it would seem that the first point in the program should be precisely this idea, and then should follow the concrete means with which we shall achieve this goal.

The program we are discussing today clearly reflected the attitude of the Leningrad party organization toward socialism and its further destiny. This is quite timely and correct. But while working with the entire party today on a solution to statewide problems, including political ones, we must rely in our program on the unification of all of us in our common desire to make Leningrad and Leningraders worthy of one another.

This uniting principle can and should be the status of the Leningrad soviet, the status of Leningrad. It is very good that this idea was supported by Communists and also found support among the city's creative workers. This shows that the Leningrad spirit is alive in Leningraders. Perhaps some will attribute my words to something like

local patriotism. So be it; I personally see nothing wrong with that. On the contrary, universal patriotism, if one may call it that, finds its basis in local patriotism, just as large Russia begins with the small homeland.

Of course, we cannot achieve economic well-being and prosperity in Leningrad alone, and it is pointless to hope for that. But we can and should introduce order into the city. This is the main reason why Leningrad needs a special status in the area of economic and sociocultural activity. An analysis of the variant of the USSR law on local self-management and the local economy shows that even within the framework of this adopted act the Leningrad soviet cannot fully provide for legal regulation of the complex problems that have accumulated in the city. Unfortunately, the question of expanding the rights of Leningrad and the oblast in economic and sociocultural activity has not been properly disclosed either in the report or in the program. Yesterday the executive committee of the Leningrad soviet discussed its variant of the draft USSR law on this issue and adopted a decision to bring it up for consideration at the next session of the Leningrad soviet.

We assume that the adoption of this normative act will create a solid legal economic basis for preparing Leningrad for a gradual changeover to self-financing within the framework of both internal and external, regional economic accountability. If the session approves this variant of the law it will be brought up for general discussion of Leningraders.

At the same time, paying attention to the fact that the law will go into force during a transitional period when because of objective factors economic methods cannot be fully put into effect, we have introduced into the draft law an article which envisions granting the Leningrad soviet fairly broad rights in state and administrative construction, including with respect to issues of administrative-territorial division, administrative legal violations, and also interrelations with central management organs.

Therefore, I consider it necessary to introduce into the program of actions a point to the effect that Communists, and not just leading Communists, must not have any privileges and, moreover, they must work more and better than others.

Now a couple of words about the soviets in the modern stage. Recently the city soviet and its executive committee have appreciably activated their work in many areas. But the criticism heard in the report and the appeals of Leningraders to the leaders and apparatuses of the executive committees of the local soviets should be recognized as fully justified. Many of them do not want to take on the full burden of responsibility, and our executive discipline is still low in a number of places. Manifestations of elements of bureaucratism and callousness of apparatus workers are not rare.

We must say directly that in this area an active position is far from always taken by rayon party committees that are called upon to provide political leadership through the Communists and through the party organizations of the apparatuses of local soviets. We could avoid so many reproaches and complaints from city residents if the evaluation of the activity of each Communist were based on two unchanging conditions: mandatory and complete execution of decisions that are made and sensitivity and benevolence toward people.

As a communist who is working in the soviet I am deeply convinced that we have already done enough talking about the fact that the local soviets are not ready to take the power into their own hands. Now as never before the meaning of all our joint—I emphasize joint—work lies in the achievement of a concrete final result which would be familiar and comprehensible to each Leningrader.

I cannot but say a couple of words about the forthcoming elections.

This most important intrapolitical process even today has become the epicenter of the conflict of opinions of many social and political forces. As we know, passions flared up especially strongly around the problem of whether or not we were to have production okrugs. Of course, under the conditions of socialist pluralism, democratization, and glasnost there is a splash of the most diverse ideas directed toward improvement of the society and its electoral system. But not one of them has evoked such contradictions as that of the production okrugs.

The executive committee of the Leningrad soviet, taking into account the crucial social nature of the problem, has discussed it twice at its meetings and, as we know, did not come to a unanimous opinion. The materials were published in the press. Today the executive committee of the Leningrad soviet has received more than 20,000 responses from labor collectives and citizens speaking out against elections through production okrugs. There were only a few responses in favor of it.

In response to the united front of the workers the executive committee of the Leningrad soviet developed an alternative variant of the procedure for elections from production okrugs. One must say directly that this question is very complex and delicate, and therefore the majority are still inclined to hold the elections through the territorial okrugs.

Taking into account how crucial this issue is, in the next few days the Leningrad soviet will make a final decision on it.

I think the attitude toward this problem was expressed quite definitely in the report. I fully support the position in the report to the effect that the elections of leaders should be conducted only through the territorial okrugs. This should be reflected in the decree since certain of the mass media consider elections through production okrugs to be the "last hope of the apparatus."

One must say that this idea does not come from the apparatus. And I think that the results of the elections, if we all go into them with the platform we are approving today, will finally on 4 March give an evaluation of the program of actions of the Leningrad Communists.

And in conclusion I wish to say that as a member of the party Central Committee I fully support the proposal to hold the plenum of the party Central Committee on the eve of the Second Congress of People's Deputies so as to discuss earth-shaking issues of life within the party there.

Yu.I. Arefin, instrument fitter of the M.I. Kalinin Zavod production association

I just recently returned from Finland on business and, taking into account the fact that there are television cameras here, I should like to be heard in Moscow. I ask you to give me a couple of minutes.

My trip to Turku, our sister city in Finland, only strengthened my conviction that we must accomplish our perestroyka as quickly and efficiently as possible. In order to do this, in my opinion, we must first of all define the position Communists are to hold. We shall not be able to do anything without defining our position. I agree fully with the report and basically I agree with the program we have been given for familiarization.

We have Communists who like for us to vote by name. Thus I, Arefin, Yuriy Ivanovich, will vote for this program. And as a Communist I shall fully support Gorbachev's policy. In the report we already heard—and I think, comrades, we must make clear who is on which side of the fence. I am a supporter of Gorbachev and not that group of people represented by the newspaper OPPOZITSIYA. I was reading it near the Chernyshevskaya metro stop. There it is written clearly: "Organ of supporters of Yeltsin, Sakharov, et al." So this is a position I do not support.

We are now saying a lot about the cult of Stalin and criticizing it a great deal. I think that is all legitimate. But, comrades, let us look and see if we do not have new cult heroes now, in the new times.

I can give this example: No matter how much you listen to the radio and television, Comrade Sobchak keeps popping up. I do not think he is the embodiment of all of our party organization and all of the Supreme Soviet, and there are probably people there who are stupider than he is from whom one could get an interview. Therefore I would like to say that when our mass media find something that catches their attention, a new cult grows up of its own accord.

I should also like to say that we heard in the report and comrades have said here that the People's Front has become quite well acclimatized. The impression is that they are in command and we are not in command.

I am not in any front except the CPSU. I think that we must give battle here. Why should we be afraid of them? I grabbed a copy of the magazine OGONEK to bring with me so that nobody would say that I am falsifying, but in this issue of OGONEK there is an article by Comrade Bogomolov entitled "With a Slow, Timid Zigzag Step." Here he scolds both the Central Committee and us, the Leningrad Oblast and city party committees. On what basis, one might ask. On the basis that someone stepped on his toes? I know him personally and he knows me. We have been on different sides of the fence since the time of stagnation. Is it really not possible for us to enter into a polemic and prove which of us is right? I think we can and should. Then the people will also understand who is who.

It was not without reason that I spoke of Moscow. Yesterday in the newspaper ARGUMENTY I FAKTY our secretary of the Party Central Committee, Medvedev, gave answers to questions. I myself think that now ARGUMENTY I FAKTY is a fairly normal newspaper and I do not think there is justification for raising any discussions about it. Previously it was somewhat aggressive, but now ARGUMENTY is a normal newspaper, such as they are. But if I were to go to the magazine OGONEK with the same article that Bogomolov had, I am confident that Korotich would now publish it. I am convinced that it is only because I am a member of the Leningrad party city committee.

This, of course, does not do honor to our mass media.

Now about glasnost. When I was in Finland I met with some communists and asked them this question: Tell me, please, what is your reaction to our glasnost? They answered me: Bad. Because your glasnost is severed, broken pieces, and all these capitalist publications convey it however they like. History must be presented as it was, and very many people do not know how our life has developed.

I am of the generation that experienced the war, I am a native Leningrader, I experienced the blockade, I was evacuated, I was taken prisoner, and I returned to Leningrad in 1944. I saw all this with my own eyes and I know. And when they call our fathers, mothers, and grandparents a crowd, excuse me, please. I was reared by my step father who went as a volunteer in 1941 and died at Lugo. So those many thousands of people, Leningraders, who went with bayonets and rifles against tanks were a crowd, were they? We must straighten this matter out, Comrades. If you do not know history yourselves then ask us; we will tell you how it was in those days.

A general director, of Svetlana, I think, spoke here, and we of the Kalinin plant are in contact with them there. I happened to be watching a TV program and one comrade who was speaking said that there was a dictatorship of the general directors. I think that the deputies who speak this way do not understand the essence of the matter. We must support the general directors like the agrarians and the directors of sovkhozes and kolkhozes. As long as we producers—workers, kolkhoz workers, engineers, technicians—are producing products, no matter how long you sit there in Moscow, you will not

lull the people to sleep with words. Only when we make the corresponding products will they appear in the stores.

The mass media sometimes complain that they are pressured here, oppressed, but as I understand it many of their workers are communists and they should understand the situation and present material in such a way that it does not do harm to the country's overall development. We are saying a lot about Leningrad here, but I am a Leningrader and I support whatever will advance our common culture, and not only the culture of the center of the city but also the culture of the working class and our intelligentsia. For example, when our esteemed academician Likhachev spoke at the congress we workers listened to him and backed him all the way when he said that an uncultured person could not be a high producer. Only a highly educated person will become that modern worker, the engineer.

N.M. Nikitin, head energy engineer of the Leningradskiy Metallicheskiy Zavod pipe construction production association

Having considered the draft of our program and consulted in the collective, I basically support it. But I wish to add that our program (not the draft but the program) finally and firmly determine the time—and it will probably be 1990—for the unification of our oblast and city committees.

I should like to note that in terms the program's content socioeconomic questions are included on the last page, although it says in the first paragraph that today the standard of living of the Leningraders is the most important political and economic task of Leningrad communists. I suggest that this part be moved to the first pages of the program.

From the speeches and the report we can see that our situation, unfortunately, is not improving; enough time has passed since April but time is not working for us. On the threshold are the elections to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and the local soviets. I have the impression that if we do not impose order in the city in the area of reducing crime and various machinations (I do not wish to use any other terms) in the area of the economy, the people will not follow us. On this plane the clock started running long ago—in 1985. My opinion is that the measures we began to undertake throughout the country in 1983 would not be out of place now either. In many areas. I have the impression that products are products, but the social protection of the citizens is the most important aspect of the life of our population. After consulting with the workers of the plant and association—and practically every day we begin an exchange of opinions about who bought what and where and what happened—you come to the conclusion that social protection is not progressing today and remains below the level the people have asked from us, and we are the servants of the people.

I would like to discuss the problems of youth. In principle we are building for them. Most of the people who are gathered here are middle-aged and older. You know that today the party is purging itself. But what about the Komsomol and the mass exodus from the Komsomol? It is difficult to understand youth and how to educate them, what to promise them. When speaking with the simple chaps who have completed the PTU [vocational and technical school] or came here through redistribution as engineering and technical personnel you come to the conclusion that today the labor placement of these young people in Leningrad differs significantly depending on their segment of the population. Certain parents have been able to accumulate a certain amount of money for their sons and daughters, and all this, naturally, is passed on through inheritance. But what about the rest of them? I do not wish to say that all youth have succumbed to money grubbing and are trying to accumulate something and outdo one another in this area. But nonetheless this is largely what explains the influx of youth into both good and bad cooperatives. Youth figure in many of the production operations about which we hear on the radio and see on the television screen.

How do we get out of such a serious situation? The separation is going further and further. This is my opinion and one can undoubtedly argue with it, but I think it is necessary for youth to believe in us and to follow us. But they always have been and always will be in the vanguard in new things. We must promise them only equal rights.

In this connection I should like to discuss the fact that the immense amount of money the population have gotten their hands on by hook or by crook might not be used for its intended purpose and might also be passed on through inheritance to the younger generation, which will undoubtedly irritate the youth who have no property. I think that we must think about how the Supreme Soviet can nationalize this money. Today is a time of revolutionary changes and without such strict measures, in my opinion, we cannot achieve equal rights.

I would also like to say literally a couple of words about agriculture, about the difficulties being discussed by our agricultural workers and plant collectives engaged in patronage assistance. Today it is clear that the personnel of these subdivisions are not suitable for the tasks for which they will be held responsible with regional economic accountability. I think we must study the experience of the Baltic steamship line. But there is probably some point in making sure that it is with party instructions that party members are sending 5,000-6,000 communists to Leningrad Oblast. Even if it is for a 5-year plan; these ideas have already been heard not only in our plenums, but also among the people surrounding them.

A.A. Denisov, USSR people's deputy, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet

First of all I should like to note that I liked the report very much and I basically agree with it.

But it is one thing to adopt decisions and another thing to carry them out. When it comes to execution either this is no time for democracy or there is democracy and this is it—unwavering fulfillment of the decision that has been made—and there should be no conversation or discussion here. These should come in the stage of decision making. Still I would note that, in my view, in this report a little more attention should be devoted, in the first place, to culture—Daniil Aleksandrovich Granin was discussing this during the recess and I quite agree with him.

If only for the simple reason that Leningrad is a unique phenomenon in our Russian reality. This is practically the only city we have with European culture. This is not meant to offend others but such is the tradition, such is history. We must not let go of that which has been won by our ancestors over centuries, the accumulation of that which today is called our Leningrad culture. The party organization must be aware of the responsibility it has on this plane and it must take the appropriate steps if only to retain the level we still have. And we have lost a good deal, unfortunately, in our recent history.

One more aspect of the matter has to do with questions of the economy. A little more attention should have been devoted to this. People like to represent me as a proponent of private property. I frequently hear this. I shall not say that in general these are selfish, malicious statements, although I shall say something else about private property. I shall say that I am much more bothered by the opposite tendency, the tendency toward indiscriminate state appropriation of property. In my view, this is the main danger now. Here is why.

The fact is that a changeover to a market economy will not just happen. For in this market economy subjects of free enterprise, free entrepreneurs must be acting. This is not at all about private businessmen or about anyone else in particular. These are our state enterprises, but completely free of any kind of administrative control from above. They can be quite the same state enterprises as they were before, the directors can be the same, it is not necessary to elect them, they can even be appointed, but they must be completely free in their commercial activity.

It is easier for us to change over to the market from this side than from the other side, the side of private, cooperative, leased property which we have never had and with which we have no experience. We have experience, so to speak, in state control and we have state industry in place, but we still must change over to the market because centralized control has exhausted itself. But this is how we must change over: Not denationalization of state property but granting of independence, as it were, to free entrepreneurs. We shall never get away from the fact that we need free enterprise, but let me theorize a little. This is my passion; after all, I am first of all a scholar and cannot get away from my priorities, and I must confess that first of all I serve the truth and after that the people and after them my party.

Whether anybody likes it or not, I cannot be any different.

So, by way of theorizing. This pertains specifically to programs of the party organization about which I shall say a couple of words. I would like to add and change a few things here.

You understand that this is a very good list of all kinds of signs of socialism, but I think the problem with these lists is that they take concepts from various levels of the hierarchy of values.

Socialism could have been defined with a single phrase as a society of social justice in which conditions are created for the all-around development of any individual. Such a phrase is contained here but it is in a series of concepts of quite a different level. This is the first thing.

But what kinds of conditions are needed in order for the society to function? In general, in my view, there are only three of them. First, human values in the area of human rights. It is sad to say, but these are bourgeois values. This is why discussions arise about a return to capitalism. Yes, bourgeois-democratic revolutions opened up and unleashed freedom and made the way for these most human of values. There is nothing wrong with the fact that now, having recognized this, we subscribe to these human values, the human rights legitimized by the United Nations. We are ratifying more and more of these international agreements and indeed we are subscribing to those human rights that are the product of the bourgeois mind. They are necessary for the free development of the individual and we cannot get away from this.

There is no point in hanging labels on this. It is simply stupid to call this capitalism or some kind of bourgeois values. This flatters capitalism. Because, in the first place, they did not originate there, for the bourgeois revolutions only gave freedom to these rights and freedom to capitalism. It is not what generated these values.

But, of course, that is not the issue. It is important that these are common human values and it is simply pointless and naive to attribute them to capitalism.

The second condition besides these human values is a certain level of well-being. If we do not provide it for the people all these proclaimed human values will not be worth a plugged nickel. They simply will not be realized without a certain level of well-being.

Here, unfortunately, our recent historical experience shows that Western civilizations have had greater success than we have with respect to well-being. How? The only effective way to achieve well-being is free enterprise. It is another matter that there it has followed upon private property. We would proceed from state property, but still end up with free enterprise. But the initiative of the head of a commercial enterprise is not hampered by

anything, and this is the only thing that makes it possible to use this enterprise effectively. There simply is no other way. No matter what you dictate to him, no matter how you tie his hands and feet, there will be no point in it.

The third thing. This is purely socialist value. This is socialist justice. Note that only the third thing is an exclusive attribute of socialism. This is providing for social justice. How is it expressed? In two things. The absence of exploitation and the absence of large differences in the levels of well-being among various segments of the society. One asks if these capitalist concepts and socialist concepts are compatible. I submit that they are compatible. Although, as you know, so far experience indicates the opposite.

If I say the first two categories are found in bourgeois states I have in mind civilized bourgeois states, because there are also uncivilized bourgeois dictatorships. But we are now speaking about civilized Western countries. These conditions are more or less provided there, human rights are declared, and the standard of living is more or less provided, but there is no social justice. We have devised a system, say, Stalinist socialism, in which everything is the opposite: We have no human rights, we do not have a decent standard of living, but (and this I wish to emphasize because it is now accepted to complain about Stalinism) we do have a large social achievement. What is it? The demand for work force exceeds the supply.

This is extremely important for social justice. I think this is the only way of providing for social justice. If we had created a law-governed state and there had been no problems here, as I have already said, with civil rights, we would be subscribing to all these conventions.

I hope that in the future we shall create this kind of free enterprise. Now I can also talk about private property and I do not think we need to prohibit anything, but we must create it at the level of state enterprises. But if any cooperative, private, leasing, or other entrepreneurs spring up at the same time, let them.

So we, the socialist state and the ruling party, are obliged to structure control in such a way as to provide for social justice.

This can be done very simply and to do this we must retain the centrally controlled state sector whose task (I am setting forth this concept of socialism) is social regulation.

Cooperatives have appeared and with all their shortcomings state enterprises have experienced powerful competition precisely in this area, having to do with the workers. The workers have rushed there. Try not paying them enough and they will go where they are paid more. This is a method of regulation. This is what the state should do. Well, I do not really have very much time to discuss this. Therefore I have these suggestions in this regard.

In the first place, in the section in the area of policy and ideology: Here it has the phrase "the ideological basis of the party has been and still is scientific socialism, whose founders were Marx, Engels, and Lenin." Well, this is a completely correct phrase, but I think that if we merely bow before the values that were expressed 150 years ago I am afraid that people will not understand us and will accuse us of conservatism. Moreover we have forgotten about simple dialectics. Therefore I think we should insert a comma here and add: "The concept of which (that is, of this same socialism) is renewed and adapted to the demands of modernity by means of the dialectical method."

I think this must be done for otherwise this will be a real archaism. You understand that Lenin once departed from the initial truths of Marxism: It took only 2 years of war communism for him to understand that Marxism cannot simply be shoved down people's throats.

And further. It would be good to formulate in the following phrase... here where there is a list of all the benefits of socialism, again to observe this hierarchy.... First, define socialism as a society of social justice in which conditions are created for the all-around development of any individual, that is, take one of the theses as the main one and put it first, and then these three mandatory conditions for the realization of socialism, and then, perhaps, all that is listed here. It will, as it were, explain everything that preceded it.

These are my suggestions.

Finally, I should like to conclude with one more sentence about cooperation with all kinds of right and left fronts. I think the tone should be more reasonable here. I can see this from the position in which, for example, our general secretary finds himself where he has to take all shades of opinions into account. We should not think that he can address all accusations. Things are much more complicated than that. A political struggle is not a simple thing. It is necessary to deal with the concreteness of the truth and look at the alignment of forces. In particular, I have already said that we, the party, will be able to retain leadership and not be grasping onto the tail of perestroyka only if we are more radical than the radicals. At that time, I recall, I was almost accused of populism. Now we are increasingly coming to understand that we simply have no other way. We must be at the forefront of perestroyka and not somewhere in the middle or at the end.

What does this mean? Regardless of where reasonable proposals may appear from, we must make them our own. If this suits us and if it coincides with our intentions, we must simply consider them ours. This is the only thing we can do.

S.G. Petrov, secretary of the Leningrad Gorkom

As I understand it, the program under discussion is receiving general support today, but there is one question which disturbs me a great deal: How can we make sure that it does not gather dust in the safes of party workers and other officials.

Today this program gives us a fairly good constructive working instrument, it unites our actions, and it is strengthening the unity of our ranks. It is no secret that recently we have been encountering more and more cases of disorder and instability, attempts on the part of certain forces to drive a wedge into the party in order to create a schism in its organization and activity. Indeed it is difficult not to agree with conclusions to the effect that being in the party of the people with sometimes diametrically opposed views is political nonsense. It is quite logical to assume that sooner or later this standoff will lead to open confrontation and a split in party ranks.

Should we passively wait for such an end so that then (as has repeatedly been the case) in retrospect we can state that we had nothing to do with the development of events. Would it not be better to take active steps to prevent such things. I think the party organizations would be right if they helped those who are wavering to make a choice of whether to go with the party or not.

But in order to achieve not merely apparent unity but a deeply felt solidarity, we need sensitivity in our strategy and tactics for the political struggle in the modern stage and clarity of the party's role in the life of the society and its ideological and organizational foundations.

All this should be clarified, in my view, during the course of extensive discussion within the framework of the preparations for the 28th Party Congress and the development of the new program and regulations so that everyone can check to see if he agrees with the goals that have been earmarked and make a well-founded choice.

This period is also important for us in that it is necessary to work out (perhaps this is not exactly the right way of putting it) a new structure for management of the Leningrad party organization, having made it extremely clear to every Leningrader, a structure which is cable of reacting efficiently and effectively to the political situation in the city.

In this stage I consider the approach proposed in the report to be the most expedient. In this case radicalism seems unacceptable to me. In general we must recall a bit of folk wisdom which says that it is better to think for two days and work for one than to spend a week doing things over. Let us approach this issue in approximately this way.

While sharing with the speakers a dissatisfaction with the activity of the Party Central Committee and certain members of the Politburo and with the imperfection of the existing structures, I cannot agree that the root of all the evil lies here. By shifting public awareness in the direction of reformism and consumer distribution, we ourselves with enviable resistance to any kind of logic are generating more and more new organizational proposals, thinking that, even if it is poorly prepared for, we will hold an extraordinary or extra congress and this will solve everything: The crisis will be halted and the political situation will be normalized.

This is nothing other than the old belief in a kind master who will make a judgment, only in collegial form. Let us look at this realistically from the standpoint of the present day and the situation that has developed here in Leningrad.

In the heat of the polemics we forget that the decision on a platform and program is only an instrument, and the basis for everything is his majesty work. Today we have confused the concepts to such an extent that the loudmouthed demagogues with their fast talking have gained more authority than the person who simply works, who does real work at his job, whether he be a worker, an engineer, or a scientist.

I can say without exaggeration that under the current, extremely difficult conditions of perestroyka many party organizations have not been able to be true fighters for change and have not been able in practice to transform the strategy of renewal to the concrete state of affairs of the collectives or to motivate and lead the people. Our collegial organs—the city and oblast party committees—have not distinguished themselves in this respect either. Hence the wheel spinning, the dissatisfaction, the confusion, the lack of confidence in the future, the constantly worsening situation in the economy, the ecology, and other spheres of our life.

Today it is no longer enough to support the changes in words, everybody must get down to specific work and with his actions and deeds each day, each hour make perestroyka a reality. Unfortunately, we do not yet have many examples of an active position on the part of party organizations, and unless large changes take place here the upper echelons will be powerless. Neither firing party leaders nor organizational-structural movements will help us here. The process of perestroyka must be nurtured from below; it has no other source.

I consider it necessary to touch upon one more issue for which I found no support during the course of the working of the commission for preparing the program. This pertains to the socioeconomic section which, in my view, suffers from its distinct echoes of the administrative-command style with elements of urging by the soviets, which cannot be allowed since this would be a serious political mistake. I understand the argument of our opponents who, based on letters from communists and nonparty members, say that the Leningraders want to see in the program absolutely concrete measures for creating humane living conditions and it is better to have one small concrete victory than dozens of wordy programs or points—it is difficult not to agree with that.

But nonetheless I think that in order to avoid false interpretations of the program we should introduce as a first point or a preamble to the socioeconomic section

the following entry: "Leningrad communists, taking responsibility for the state of the development of the socioeconomic sphere, will increase their influence over social processes, including the economy, through political methods, which means: The party will wield influence not from outside but from within the state economic organizations by means of the activity of its members. It develops the economic policy in the interests of the workers and defends it at all levels. The party maintains the right to keep an eye on communists who are responsible for concrete areas of economic construction and, in keeping with the regulations, selects, trains, and advances personnel, defending their candidacies at all levels. A communist may occupy a post when he wins the trust of the people through his authority and personal position."

This formulation gives the initiative to party organizations. I ask that this thesis be used as a basis for its inclusion in the program since today this is precisely how one must understand the essence of the party policy. I emphasize: Party policy in the sphere of the economy. Thus it will be possible to remove the contradiction between form and content.

The last thing. The pre-election struggle has practically already begun and all of our work would not be worth a plugged nickel if the program of action did not become the basis for the election of Leningraders. They will be voting for people who have advanced it and are implementing it.

We must appeal to the residents of our city: Do not be in a hurry to throw away the newspaper after you have read over the program. The candidates who take it as a basis will develop and concretize its provisions—these will be our candidates whether they are party members or not. Our program is a program of creation and not destruction. It is a program of hard, stage-by- stage, prolonged work. It does not promise victory and abundance tomorrow, but it is honest and viable. We must give a guarantee that it will be fulfilled. Let us struggle for that.

More Delegates' Remarks

90UN0419B Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 24 Nov 89 pp 1-4

[Report on delegates' remarks at joint plenum of Leningrad CPSU Oblast Committee and CPSU City Committee: "For Socialist Ideals of Perestroyka"]

[Excerpts] **V.F. Kovalev,chairman of the board of Lenoblpotrebsoyuz**

On behalf of the 350,000 oblast shareholders, of whom every sixth one is a communist, I would like to convey to the participants in the plenum, our concern and even alarm about the methods for resolving the problems raised by time and perestroyka.

I earnestly ask, as we have done repeatedly, that you not confuse consumer cooperation in the oblast, which has billions in circulation and serves 40% of the population, with that new branch of the cooperative movement (its share is 0.5%) which has been cared for with such surprising interest and concern by many USSR deputies for more than 2 months now.

It is quite obvious that the country is experiencing an economic, political, and social crisis. We fully agree with the point of the report to the effect that we are in the same boat drifting according at the mercy of the waves without a rudder and without a sail. One wants to exclaim, "Hey, you there topside!" When will we have laws that really work for perestroyka? Who bears responsibility for that large part of legislative acts that have to do with cooperation, elections, state enterprises, and foreign trade, which have flooded the economy and evoke apathy, mistrust, and alarm in the people?

To begin with, we must immediately make corrections in the Law on the State Enterprise. We must not continue to sink into chaos and anarchy, where group egoism is flourishing and the enterprises do not serve the interests of the state and the people.

The dictatorship of the producer has led to catastrophic results. It can be no other way if, instead of 5 bars of soap at 20 kopecks, they produce 1 bar but it costs 1 ruble; instead of three pairs of shoes, they offer one at triple the price. Only yesterday there was a trade fair for buying footwear produced by Proletarskaya Pobeda No 2 and Lenvesna for 1990. They will fail to produce 50 million rubles' worth of footwear for trade next year. This means 1 million pairs of bare feet! The reserves in all the commodity groups are enough not for days, but for hours. And we cannot approach the elections with completely empty shelves. Trying to fill in these gaps, cooperators of the oblast are now feverishly opening meat processing, confectionery, and sewing shops and bakeries; they are restoring neglected productions and purchasing unprofitable ones from others.

In the midst of all the general crisis situations, under the current 5-year plan we have increased the output of consumer goods by a factor of 2.5. And this year we are 14 million rubles above last year's level. This is even a little more than all of Leningrad industry failed to produce. And after all, we have also had STK [Council of Labor Collectives] and economic accountability since the establishment of cooperation; and the strikes have an influence, but each year the output of consumer goods from domestic enterprises increases by 25-30%. And this is without obtaining funds for raw materials from centralized sources. Basically, all the raw material is purchased from the population and then processed and sold. And of the commodity turnover of 1 million rubles, products from purchasing and processing imported goods amounts to almost 300 million rubles or the same amount as that by which we are hoping to increase our output through conversion [of defense industry enterprises]. Or, as it has wittily been christened—"convulsion."

We do not share the optimism that enterprises that were producing tanks and missiles yesterday will begin to produce high-quality irons and casseroles today. True, the prices for them will be at the level of the price of the latest generation of personal computer.

I suggest: Some of the quota of the contract—say, 10-15 million rubles for the 5-year plan—should be devoted to the development of processing enterprises with consumers' cooperation, where they will produce an immediate return. This is a pivotal issue. We have money and we have purchased and are already receiving fully equipped enterprises. These include a meat processing plant that can produce 5 tons per shift with the imported version; three sausage and four confectionery shops; eight cattle slaughter points; two canning plants that can produce 3 million several containers a year; two cheese shops; four refrigeration facilities of 1,000 and 500 tons; production lines for smoked sausage, sweet straw, felt slippers, knitted items; six bakeries, and so forth. And the volume of consumer goods will redouble, for this is an immense force in support of perestroyka and for the sake of the region's self-support. Here we can realize the colossal possibilities of consumers' cooperation which is now experiencing a second rebirth.

We can now contribute to the city's food resources tens of thousands of sheep and goats purchased from the population which can be delivered into the union fund. But the meat combine of the Leningrad city agroindustrial complex refuses to accept small livestock from us. The situation suffers as a result, and there are many complaints from the population. And where can one buy fresh mutton today without standing in line?

Continuing with the painful subject of shortages of consumer goods, I cannot but reproach the secretaries of party committees of all ranks and degrees. There have been a lot of words but no final results. With all the difficulties, including because of the STK, it is difficult to hold the leaders responsible. Observing democracy and collegiality, this is precisely what our party committees and the board did by nipping the virus of collective egoism in the bud.

And if any other branch of the national economy had provided even one-third of the increase in goods that cooperation did, the shelves of the stores would be breaking from being overloaded.

And again about conversion. This year, in April, from the podium of the plenum I already had occasion to speak about the fact that on the basis of defense enterprises in Leningrad we should organize series production of three-fourths of the items of processing equipment. And through consumers' cooperation, once our market has been saturated, they can move to other kinds of equipment in the oblasts of Russia or the entire union. But now we are literally grinding out meat processing equipment in Krasnoyarsk, public catering equipment in Vladimir, and bread baking equipment in Belgorod. We are justifiably reproached for the fact that Leningraders cannot produce such generally simple thing for themselves. One is simply ashamed of Leningrad.

We see a large reserve in cooperation with enterprises of the region, as was done with the Kirovskiy Zavod production association, Krasnogvardeyets, and a number of others.

And another problem: Many blame the fact that people are leaving for the cooperatives. This process has affected our economy as well, but very insignificantly, since we fulfilled the 5-year assignment for introducing housing long ago; we give additional payments to pensioners, underprivileged shareholders, and mothers with many children from above-plan profits; and to people who have worked irreproachably for 25 years and more we give up to a 20-month bonus when they go on pension. All this reduces labor turnover.

We are against long-term programs which might be realized in the next millennium—people do not believe in them. These should only be guidelines —the well-being of the people must be created today. Hurry, comrades, and participate in this noble work, remembering that consumers' cooperation is a real force which will not halt its activity in any political situation.

Support the proposal made here to convene an extraordinary plenum of the Party Central Committee at which we must immediately determine the paths of further movement forward. We have no other choice.

V.Ye. Kukushkin, first secretary of the Kirov Party City Committee

Today's plenum of the party obkom [oblast committee] and gorkom [city committee] is especially crucial and significant. Leningrad communists are looking to us with hope to see where our Leningrad party organization will lead us and which path it will take.

Judging from the published draft of the program of actions, in our view there still are no sufficiently clear and straightforward guidelines. As participants in the plenum of the Kirov Gorkom emphasized, this future form of connection between elective party organs and the rank-and-file communists in the draft that was submitted did not become a unifying principle for the majority of party organizations. What is the reason for this? In my view, there is still not enough constructivism or radicalism.

One can say directly that we have an extraordinary situation in Leningrad at the present time. And this means that the measures should be extraordinary to a certain degree. We are faced with the crisis of perestroyka, and it is conditioned largely by the crisis in the party. During the course of the discussion of the program of action, one of the basic measures proposed by communists and nonparty members was the demand to immediately convene the 28th Party Congress. This has already been discussed by a number of the speakers. The persistent need for this is dictated by a number of

circumstances and factors. I do not agree with a number of speakers here about this subject. Allow me to discuss this.

In the first place—this is emphasized in the new draft of actions of the Leningrad party organization—the path to democratizing the party earmarked by the 19th Party Conference is being implemented extremely slowly and inconsistently. The current composition of the Central Committee and its Politburo, as the basic party staffs, are still not providing an example with respect to these issues. Frequently they do not go beyond declaring general principles; and they are manifestly doing a poor job of developing the basic conceptual points of party development under modern conditions. The renewal of the composition of the Party Central Committee that was conveyed to us as the most important factor in restructuring of the party itself is regarded by the rank-and-file communists as a process taking place behind the scenes and that they have practically no participation in.

Communists are confused by the fact that during the course of the heated political discussions, when people are trying to defame the party and force it out of the political arena, we do not hear the voices of the members of the Party Central Committee or its Politburo concerning the most crucial issues. The fact that convening the regular congress in a short period of time could lead to a split in the unity of the party ranks cannot stand up under criticism either. We have heard about this here today as well. Everyone understands that we do not really have that unity anyway. We are faced with separatism that is being openly proclaimed by party delegations of the Baltic and Transcaucasian areas and Moldavia. Thousands of communists, both those with initiative and nontraditional thinking and those who are wavering and have not lost their faith in the party's ability to lead the society are finding a way to realize their potential through the activity of informal political movements. All this shows that the party is losing the initiative and is losing the support of the masses, which existed objectively at times when it has adopted bold, unconventional solutions and taken resolute actions.

The party is already doing a great thing by selecting on an entirely new basis a central committee which will boldly implement its new policy relying on the support of the millions of communists who elected them. To these ends it is necessary to approve the new instructions that were discussed today concerning elections of delegates to the congress. The pressing need to quickly convene the next, 28th congress is dictated also by the fact that in the USSR Supreme Soviet at the next Congress of People's Deputies they will resolve basic issues that are fundamental to our society. I have in mind the question of further paths to political reform, the place of the party in the society, the political structure, property, and the modern concept of socialism. I would consider it necessary to immediately initiate party wide discussion of these issues. So that it is not the Congress of People's Deputies but the party itself that determines its position and role in the life of the country.

And another thing. In this connection a question being raised by many communists is quite legitimate: Why is the party and its Central Committee in opposition to the side that is arming itself, why does the party not have its own deeply substantiated and consistent line, and why with such an intellectual potential does it not have any clearcut arguments regarding all these questions? I do not think we shall find any answers to these questions as long as we are playing a waiting game and simply stating the need for democratic changes.

Two months have passed since the decision was made to convene the 28th Party Congress. But so far nothing has actually been done to prepare for it. We are letting time pass with inadmissible, unforgivable indifference. We cannot allow this situation to continue, we must act.

Communists of the GDR are setting a good example for us. They were able to surmount the situation and take the initiative into their own hands. It would be naive to assume that millions of communists in our country do not see this. We need a basic party shakeup and this will be largely determined by our success in the forthcoming elections to the local soviets. In essence the entire country is watching us Leningraders. Therefore we must develop our own evaluation of the present state of affairs in the party and earmark ways of getting out of this situation.

But so far there is no unity in this matter. The example of the Vasileostrovskiy party raykom in conducting a rally shows this better than anything else. Each region tries to occupy its own unique position. It seems that this does not consolidate or unite our forces. Separation and lack of coordination only plays into the hands of our opponents, which we, comrades, do not have the right to do.

The situation in the economy is no less complicated. The operation of enterprises and organizations under the new management conditions in an unpredictable political atmosphere is far from stable. It is impossible to understand, for example, what the strike committees of Moldavia and Armenia were counting on when they appealed for moral and material support to the workers of the Ladoga Plant who failed to receive many thousands of rubles' worth of batching items from them. And the plant collective, which was not making delivers under contracts for almost 4 million rubles, is in an extremely difficult financial condition and is holding back wages. All this creates an explosive situation in the labor collectives and has a painful effect on the needs of the workers.

As the leader of a party organization of a rayon in the oblast I am bothered by the problem of the development of Leningrad Oblast. My colleagues will agree with me that it is largely of our own making. So far we do not have a program for its further development, both economic and social, that is clear cut and, the main thing, that is supported by the workers of the oblast. These are problems of the dying rural areas and the villages

without futures where things simply cannot change without material and financial support from the region.

The attitude toward the oblast on the part of Leningrad enterprises and departments that have productions here is not changing either. In our rayon and, I know, in many others there has long been a policy of pumping out funds without giving anything in return. Especially zealous in this respect is the former main administration of Lenstroymaterialy which left after its liquidation impoverished villages like that of our "builder" in the city of Otradnoye, the October Railroad, which essentially brought housing in the village of Mga to the verge of collapse. Similar activity is typical of Lentorf, the Leningrad river port, and many others.

We must put an end to such policies. To do this it is necessary for the local party and soviet organs to be full-fledged masters of the territory and to develop and adopt their own decisions concerning its development.

Another, no less important issue is the relationship between the city and the oblast. This has already been discussed today. It is possible to debate a long time about how we are to overcome this territorial barrier. It is possible to merge party, soviet, and any other organs, but that will not give us a result. At the same time life itself suggests the right path to us—it is mutually advantageous economic interests. Nobody will deny that the major function of the oblast is to feed the city dwellers and itself. A persistent opinion has developed that the oblast does not have sufficient resources for this. But who has analyzed these resources in depth? Who has determined the possibilities of the many thousands of hectares of abandoned, neglected land that is taken out of circulation each year, including that which has undergone land reclamation? In our rayon alone this kind of land amounts to about 10,000 hectares. The rayon has neither the forces nor the money to cultivate it.

For the city to invest money in developing this land would be of direct advantage to Leningraders and would mean additional food products, and the addition would be significant and varied. Contractual forms of interrelations between the city and the oblast must become the main content of all the work for implementing the food program of the Leningraders.

And the last thing. One can only be amazed by how the highly developed industrial potential of Leningrad can exist side by side with the extremely low level of farming and animal husbandry and the life style of the rural residents. Can Leningrad really continue to put up with this? It seems to me that it has long been time for the party obkom to have a clearcut program of actions in this area. And the Leningraders must support us. [passage omitted]

Yu.K. Sevenard, chief of the Lengidroenergospetsstroy production construction-installation association

First of all, apparently, in this stage we must figure out what perestroyka is. We must formulate its goals and tasks concretely and not in fine-sounding phrases. I assume that without a clearcut program for perestroyka, without instruments, including the press, which will provide for its implementation, the random drive for apparent truths will inevitably lead our society and state into the abyss of collapse. And we are already witnesses to every increasing disorganization caused by poorly thought-out decisions and actions of the current leadership "from above" and the provoking actions of political and economic adventurers "from below."

As concerns questions of the agenda, I should like to say that I have looked at the program to see how I could actively participate in its preparation. But you know that there are so many issues that it would be practically impossible to change anything.

The first secretary of the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] Obkom spoke here and said that this is not a program. Perhaps it is indeed not a program but a platform. A platform of the basic directions, policy, and ideology in various areas. If we look at it in this way then I will not vote for it; but if it is a final program then we have probably disclosed the theme there. Apparently from it we are to develop a package or many packages of well thought-out measures. Concrete ones with deadlines and the means by which to carry them out.

Unfortunately it is apparent that not many comrades who have suggested radical changes to us have taken this path. It seems to me that we must start from the beginning with many questions which pertain most closely to my practical work. All that has been done is to study and begin perestroyka. Not until now are we beginning to develop it according to a developed program that is clear and worked out with specialists and not dilettantes.

You know where we have now been led by much that was proposed by the USSR Gosstroy [State Construction Committee] which, headed by Comrade Batalin, decided to reorganize the entire system and reconstruct the building: some moved to one place and other went to another. All the ministries began to yell for restructuring together. Now there is a new leader. The last one has sneaked off very quietly, having made a lot of grievous errors. He made them and then he left. Now Comrade V.M. Serov is an esteemed person and he is returning everything to the way it was was is beginning, shall we say, from the beginning. He is starting perestroyka over. Let us hope that this person is more down to earth. I happen to know him personally and he evokes unquestionable sympathy and respect. We shall hope that he will be able to make contact with all of us production workers and with everyone who is trying to figure out these issues. And he will lead the construction policy in the right direction.

Well, what about the economy? After all, construction and the economy are interconnected. It is difficult for me to speak about the degree of qualifications or erudition

of Comrade Abalkin. But, dear comrades, such stubbornness in questions which are already clearly headed for failure! For somewhere it is necessary to have the courage to find a way out of this situation. If they had prepared the issue poorly they should have seen that it was bad and had to be improved correspondingly. Either all of us fail to understand and Comrade Abalkin is the only one who understands or else it is the other way around—he is such a courageous person that he even conceals all this so that we do not ruin things. And he asks us to have faith in him for another 15 months. But after 15 months who will be able to tell whether to have faith in him or not? For the elections will be underway and we will be in trouble. And we will be to blame for letting this happen. But we already are in trouble so let us find a solution now.

Here we are speaking about local power: The soviets must take over the power in the local areas. And the soviets do not object. But still power includes means of control and it includes economic funds, that is, finances, and it includes human resources—personnel.

Even during the period of perestroyka, planning for the soviets to take over the power, we have turned the Leningrad construction committee over to the USSR Gosstroy, that is, to Comrade Batalin. Now, Comrade Serov, I do not know whom he gave it to if anybody, but the city does not have this powerful, extremely strong construction organization which was to have solved our social problems. It exists in the sense of political work but not in the sense of the legal authority of the soviet, either oblast or city.

We speak about the fact that monopolization is a dangerous thing, but still within the walls of the Leningrad construction committee, whether it is under the jurisdiction of the Leningrad city ispolkom [executive committee] or the Leningrad oblast ispolkom, we have monopolized the entire construction materials industry. This is also said to have been "restructured." But it turned out that all the other construction subdivisions (and there are many of them; they do at least 30 percent of the volume in addition to what is done by the Leningrad construction committee, and these are basically social problems) have been left practically without locally produced material resources. Now they are at pains to find ways out of the situation. There are many ways of rectifying things. But all of them can be successful only if this production is demonopolized.

The Leningrad construction committee also has something to be concerned about—the production of construction materials. If we solve the problem of their adequate development it will be easier simply to acquire materials so it will be able to devote all of its attention to construction. And it monopolizes everything in order to keep it all for itself. Anyone would like to do that, but the region as a whole has suffered a great deal.

The authority in the local areas is not complete today. There are many questions. For example, what is democracy? Everyone understands that in his own way. Democracy which is expressed in the fact that they have begun to elect leaders; what kind of democracy is that? All right, they have elected me; I have been elected unanimously. Apparently Comrade Khizh, my colleague in industry, received a fairly large number of votes. But in the subdivisions they can whomever they want. How do I teach them to work and solve their common problems? There will so many changes, such a strain on the nerves! And then they elect them again. This, comrades, is not the way to do it. If they were to elect just one, although I do not have the final word, of course, but the higher leader should select the team himself. The selection of personnel should be a matter for the party but they should do a better job than they did before—under real conditions this is the only reliable system. That is what I think. There should be qualifications and there should be a potential reserve of energy. There should be responsibility and, if you will, nobility. People with these qualities should be promoted. And it should not be simple voting. That is subjective even if it is a mass phenomenon.

And the last thing. Questions of glasnost. Comrades, if in this situation of glasnost we do not learn how to run production, all of our attempts, all of our programs will go up in smoke or lie around in the safes. It must be admitted that today the press and the mass media are so much in charge of the situation that in order to manage it we generally must bow before them and beg. Vladimir Ilich Lenin said about the press that the press is our sharpest weapon. And we are voluntarily turning over this weapon if we have not already done so. Now the Komsomol committee is expressing its attitude toward the newspaper SMENA, but whose newspaper is this? We must think about this and make the party and Komsomol press be a reflection of our goals and tasks, it must be a propagandist for us. Without this, because of the difficulty of the tasks, we shall not be able to cope with them and we shall end up with nothing. Glasnost must be responsible. Irresponsible glasnost will lead to disordering the people's psychology. I am calling for the comrade USSR people's deputies to work out a law on responsibility for disinformation and incitement through the press and other mass media, for distortion of facts, and for discrediting causes and people.

I insist on this, comrades, because without this glasnost will do more harm than good for the success of perestroyka, which is directed toward significant development of the soviet system and improvement of the society's unity.

Ye. P. Yudin, chairman of the Leningrad City People's Control Committee

I wish to make two suggestions about the question under discussion.

In the first place, it seems, in our platform we must unequivocally and, perhaps, more harshly condemn formalism and bureaucratism. This evil is very much alive. It has many faces. And today it is being manifested at all levels. Especially in soviet and economic activity. I am convinced that the core of the restructuring of our life, society, and, perhaps, the party itself means an uncompromising battle against bureaucratism with all of its manifestations.

In my view, little has changed on this extremely important front during the past years. This is shown by the numerous complaints and letters from workers. What, for instance, can one say to a doctor of medical sciences, a professor, a person who today things about the fate of our perestroyka and who for several years has been unsuccessfully asking for the leaks to be eliminated in his apartment in the Petrograd area. During these years he has received three official answers, including over the signature of the deputy chief of the Leningrad housing administration, Comrade Metus, which sets the dates and gives the instructions, and they were even to check to make sure this was done. But he was forced to go to the city people's control committee since once again the promises were not kept.

Or how does one evaluate, for example, the actions of Glavlenplodovoshchprom which is headed by Comrade Lazaryan and the leadership of our esteemed Leningrad gorispolkom concerning completing the work and and releasing for operation the mechanized line Tok-15 at the Vyborg vegetable base. Taking a state approach and understanding the importance of this problem, the workers, who have practically already created the technical equipment, were forced to turn to the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. They had to ask for support there because for a long time they had been unable to obtain it in Leningrad. And yet this complex should have put into operation in 1987 and almost R4 million of state and public money have already been spent on its development.

Quite recently its creation was considered a priority task for Leningraders. Many party and soviet leaders spoke about this in their speeches, emphasizing that ultimately we would solve the problem of mechanization of this labor and would not send Leningraders to the vegetable bases. Incidentally the oblast party committee adopted several decisions regarding this issue.

Does this example not show a purely branch approach and a bureaucratic attitude to this most important city problem on the party of a number of official communist leaders? And, believe me, on the basis of people's control inspections one can give many examples like this. Therefore I suggest including in our program the following point: Recognizing that today bureaucratism and a departmental approach to business are antipodes of perestroyka, we should regard the inattentive attitude of officials toward people's needs and the formal bureaucratic work methods of individual communist leaders as actions that discredit the party and its goals and tasks.

And the second thing. I am in favor of combining the jobs of the first secretaries of the party obkom and gorkom. But there is one point here. I do not wish to speak about the concentration of power in the hands of one person; I wish to emphasize the extreme need for more collegiality in adopting fundamental decisions. And then, if you will, with greater personal responsibility on the part of all members of the obkom and gorkom bureaus and not just the first secretary.

I shall explain what I have said. As we know, a great personal contribution was made to the development of the Intensifikatsiya-90 program by the former first secretary of the party obkom, Lev Nikolayevich Zaykov. There is probably no need to prove that in this discussion. I wish only to emphasize that for this program they adopted perhaps no less than a dozen party decisions at the level of the party obkom and gorkom. And indeed a good deal of work was done. But if one is to speak of the results, they are clearly less than expected. One of the reasons, in my view, was that with Comrade Zaykov's departure to the party Central Committee the responsibility for the implementation of this program gradually began to break down. Party organizations became less aggressive in working on it. Today, incidentally, there is no reference to the Intensifikatsiya-90 program in a single one of the documents we are considering at the plenum.

The same thing happened to what, in my view, is a principal issue about which the corresponding party decisions were also made when Leningrad's housing construction combines were changed over from rigid specialization to flexible technology, which would make it possible even under the current five-year plan to significantly raise the level of housing construction and also solve more successfully a number of important problems in urban development. But this did not happen.

It is typical that approximately the same situation developed with respect to a number of issues where an active position was taken by the next first secretary of the party obkom—Yuriy Filippovich Solovyev. Suffice it to mention the decision to form a construction committee on the basis of combining already existing main administrations. The corresponding party decisions were also made. But Yuriy Filippovich left and the ink had barely dried before people began to seriously criticize this decision. In my opinion, Comrade Sevenard was right to discuss problems of the construction committee. In general I think, Comrades, that these symptoms should alarm us. Therefore, my second suggestions is to clearly reflect in our program the principle of collective leadership and the most important condition for party restructuring.

Boris Veniaminovich spoke very well about this but, in my opinion, this somehow did not come through clearly in the platform.

Yu. G. Terentyev, secretary of the party committee of the Arsenal Production Association

It is a great pity that our hall is crowded and I cannot see many of my colleagues who are secretaries of party committees of large enterprises. Because I personally have received here the answers to many questions which are bothering me and communists of Arsenal, and I think that any communist in attendance today would receive the same uplift and would convey it to his party organization.

But I think there is a need for discussion. Yesterday the party committee met again and by a majority of votes the party committee agreed that there was no need to demand a conference and the situation was developing in such a way that the question of adopting a program could be decided here, today, so that its implementation would also begin today.

The latest version of our remarks and proposals amounts to the following: The program should appeal to man's reason, but it would be better to appeal to man's heart and to man's spirit. We have largely forgotten how to do this. We have forgotten how to set people's hearts on fire with words. I do not think that we have brought this program to the level of feelings; it is rational and cold, and we should make it more emotional. About the name: Program or platform? We are in favor of platform. We also suggest deleting the words "for deepening perestroyka" because we are getting confused about what we are supposed to do: Deepen it or expand it or elevate it—builders have been asked but they are not up on the terms either. Therefore, I think it would be better not to use these words. The meaning and significance of the title will not suffer and I do not think the supervisors will be offended.

With respect to content.

We must speak out more decisively in favor of direct elections of delegates, both to the conference and to the party congress, with the participation of all communists. Many communists say that it would be correct if the CPSU Central Committee no less frequently than once a year heard a report from the Politburo and members of the Politburo at its plenums.

Finally, a couple of remarks about the question of cooperatives which was raised. Yes, we are aware of the argument that the working class is the grave digger for the bourgeoisie. But today we can also say that the cooperatives are the grave diggers for state enterprises. I welcome the speech of the people's deputy Denisov who spoke out in defense of state enterprises. But what happens in practice? Our plan for consumer goods is being doubled today. But how are we going to fulfill it? Today we are giving birth to our grave diggers because if we become sponsors of cooperatives we can include the corresponding volume of output in our plan. We do not want to do this but what other choice have we? As a result we will dig our own graves.

Finally, opinions have been expressed about perestroyka. Perestroyka is compared with capital repair in an apartment. The difficulties are temporary and we must live through them and then things will be easier. But the workers say: We do not want be worse off today than we were yesterday. One cannot but take this into account, and perestroyka must be carried out based on this demand of the workers.

Our party committee drew up an appeal to participants in the meeting of the combined plenum. The idea of it is this:

Comrades! It is time to concentrate on the main thing. To answer the question: How should socialism be so that a person will be happier living in a socialist society than in any other sociopolitical system?

During the time of perestroyka, which has been declared to be a movement toward a new image of socialism, instead of a feeling of happiness, there has been a growing mood of mistrust, uneasiness, and general dissatisfaction. Extremists of all stripes speculate on people's mistrust: From neo-Stalinists to advocates of petit bourgeois socialism. On the one hand there is a restriction of political freedoms and extra-economic coercion inherent in the administrative-command system, and on the other—a process of further stratification of the society and a threat to state integrity.

There is no choice here. Therefore, the reactions to it are a decline of party authority, strikes by the workers, and the creation of parallel power structures.

In connection with the situation that has developed the Arsenal party committee supports the numerous suggestions to convene the CPSU congress as rapidly as possible in order to evaluate the political situation in the country and the state of affairs in the party and to make changes in the CPSU Regulations and Program. We think that before the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies a plenum of the CPSU Central Committee should be held for discussion of the draft law on property in the USSR, the report from the Politburo, and questions of preparing for and conducting the 28th CPSU Congress in April of 1990. The elections of people's deputies of republic soviets and the discussion of the program of actions of the Leningrad party organization for deepening perestroyka under modern conditions, the struggle for its implementation and democratization of the procedure for selecting delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress make it possible, in our view, to begin the report and election campaign in the party with elections to its Central Committee. We call upon members of the oblast and city committees of the CPSU, members of the CPSU Central Committee, and Leningraders to support the proposals of the Arsenal party committee.

Yu. I. Blokhin, general director of the Pozitron Association

First of all, all Leningraders would like to receive a concrete program from this plenum. Do we have one?

Yes. We have one for the congress but for the elections we do not yet have a program. Even in the section which pertains to each Leningrader and not just communists, and in the socioeconomic section there is not a single deadline except one: "Zhilishche-2000" by the year 2000. Other than that there is not a single deadline or a single person designated responsible. In one place it says "local soviets" and then a comma—and that is all. This program, of course, is not viable. I was speaking with Comrade Khodyrev about including in section II of this point "to approve the program submitted by the ispolkom of the Leningrad soviet and the oblast soviet, to approve and make certain corrections;" this would be a real delegation of authority and would be a program which could actually be shown to all Leningraders. It would include concrete deadlines, responsibility, and means of financing, but it does not have these things now, and I do not envy the deputies who have to take this program to the people. They will have to work out their own program. True, a number of raykoms have already done this —the Moskovskiy and Leningradskiy. But we should have produced an overall program. So far we have not done this. That is the first thing. The second thing has to do with the section on ideological work. I think there is much that is good in it but, again, not enough that is concrete. We should have formulated what has to be done in the area of ideology and in the system of party training, what our plenum must do, what the apparatus of the obkom and gorkom must do, and what the local party organizations must do.

I shall say briefly what, in my view, can be done. The system of party training for this training year should answer these questions for each communist: What is socialism, what is perestroyka, and what is our history? What is good in it and what is bad? This is ideology. This we do not see. Each local party organization has been obliged to help each communist find his place in perestroyka. We are not formulating that either. As concerns the secretaries of the obkoms and gorkoms, yesterday I was glad to hear the speech by Comrade Gidaspov when he said that he would speak on television once every 2 weeks. I think we should include that in our program: Make it incumbent on all secretaries to follow this example and speak about the most crucial issues on television once every 2 weeks or once a month so that the Leningraders will know precisely the viewpoints of our secretaries, so that they know who is who among our secretaries.... In the end, why are we requiring this only of the Politburo?

Now from the standpoint of other ideological issues. We are neglecting our main support. Here we are demanding a new issue of the magazine LENINGRAD. This is probably a good thing. But take the magazines NEVA and ZVEZDA. Where are the commentaries from Denisov, our secretary, on ideology, where the articles by the heads of ideological divisions—we do not see them.

In my view, when it is suggested that Mr. Stolypin's program be published in the thick journals it would be better to publish Comrade Gidaspov and his program for transforming the city of Leningrad. We shall find out that they will publish the memoirs of Milyukov but it would give me great satisfaction to read Solovyev's memoirs. That would be of much greater benefit to us.

About our party work. I support Comrade Korablev in that we need another congress, an extraordinary one, but not to develop a program. We need a congress in order to create a team which will develop this program, a team of the new Central Committee of the new Politburo. It is not so difficult to convene a congress as they say it is. Ultimately we do not have to elect 5,000 delegates, we have to elect one delegate for every 50,000 communists, and this can be done quickly by direct or secret voting. One person must select his team and we must give him this opportunity and not by reshuffling or expelling from the Central Committee people who are sometimes principled. The team is formed through direct selection and response from local party organizations and from communists, and they must select the people who are to be on our leader's team both in the Central Committee and in Leningrad.

N. I. Didenko, secretary of the party committee of the M.I. Kalinin Polytechnical Institute

Communists of the Leningrad Polytechnical Institute, like all communists of the Leningrad party organization, have discussed the draft of the program with a sense of responsibility for the fate of the society, the country, and perestroyka.

Essentially I should like to discuss two aspects: The adopting of this document as a program or platform and its content. But taking into account our shortage of time, I shall discuss only the procedure.

Integrating the opinions of communists of the Polytechnical Institute, the party committee spoke out in favor of conducting a conference at which it is necessary to adopt the document we are discussing today. The reasoning is as follows: In our time of dynamic changes in the political and economic system, each communist must participate, personally and through direct elections of delegates, in the development of such a document. Then this document will be weighty and reflect the opinion of all communists and the oblast committee and the city committee will have fulfilled the role of an executive organ.

I should like to call your attention to the fact that we are now criticizing the Central Committee, and I agree with the criticism, for not paying attention to the opinions of the oblast party committees and the rayon committees concerning the plenum or the solutions to various problems. But what about us when we fail to listen to the opinions of those same party committees and local party organizations who express their opinion in favor of holding the conference?

Therefore, I suggest including in point 3 of the section on the organizational party apparatus a phrase to the effect that "the oblast committee and the city committee give

responses to proposals from party committees regarding various issues." We have a procedure for responding to letters from workers whereby, within a maximum of a month, the party or soviet agency must give a significant answer. If a party committee of a lower level appeals to a higher one, it should receive an answer, negative or positive. In particular, if there is to be no party conference then we should be given an answer as to why not.

The next thing. I think that the section on ideological work in general reflects the latest achievements of democratization that are taking place in our country. But the socioeconomic section does not do this. I am sending concrete suggestions to the editorial commission, but I should like to discuss just one thing.

I was glad to hear the speech of Tatyana Ivanovna Goncharova when she discussed what was happening in the school and, correspondingly, what is happening in our society. I thought about our ignorance of economics. Each of us practically considers himself an expert in the field of medicine and in the field of economics. In the field of medicine because we periodically visit the doctor or the pharmacy. In the field of economics because practically every day we go to the bakery. But in principle we are economically ignorant and we have neither economic knowledge nor economic culture. It is necessary to reflect in the program the requirement for general economic education to be really effective in our region.

The last thing I should like to discuss is the speech of Yu. I. Arefin. We are talking a lot about the art of discussion these days and about the ethics of behavior. I consider the statements made about Sobchak, which were ambiguous, unclear, and indistinct, to be inadmissible. I consider it inadmissible to make such a statement about any member of our society, whether he be a communist or a nonparty member, a people's deputy or not a people's deputy. It is even more unethical to allow such statements when the person being criticized is not there.

V.I. Kireyev, first secretary of the Leninskiy Raykom

In the preamble to the program of the Leningrad party organization it says that elected party organs frequently do not strive to be active and shift responsibility to the apparatus. But, unfortunately, we have not found an answer in this program.

This must be mentioned. I think that many communists, especially elected party organs, unfortunately, today have lost faith in their ability to solve any problems.

That is, we local party organizations and rayon party committees have begun to work under the motto proclaimed by our informal groups regarding our soviets: "Tell us what you need and we shall explain to you why you cannot have it." This is why the plenum of the Vasileostrovskiy party raykom made a correct decision to conduct an extraordinary CPSU congress to discuss the crisis situation that has developed in our party, and this is why bureau of the Leninskiy CPSU Raykom made an appeal to the local party organizations concerning the deadline for holding the congress or the plenum of the Central Committee on questions of life within the party and to consider questions of making changes in the CPSU Regulations and a qualitative change in the composition of the Central Committee since it is incapable of taking exhaustive measures to change the situation in the country.

With respect to the question of why the local party organizations are losing the political initiative—it would be a good idea to note in this same program that they are the basis of our party—it is just because of the lack of a real possibility of influencing the activity of the higher party organs, right up to the Central Committee, including with respect to deadlines for conducting the congress and extraordinary conferences and plenums of the Central Committee, which we have set repeatedly sitting here in this hall, but to this day we have not received an answer. They just keep putting us off.

Today in our rayon alone, having responded to the request that was sent from the Leninskiy Party Raykom, of the 163 organizations 90 spoke out in favor of conducting an extraordinary congress, 55 abstained, and 17 voted against it. Someone once correctly expressed the idea that the pessimism about the party was caused not by a denial of its leading role but by the way it is performed.

Discussing the program of actions of the Leningrad party organization and speaking about the congress, we again raise only the fact that the time is drawing near, but why, for example, do we not send an address to the communists of the Soviet Union? About holding a discussion of our party's role and position in the modern stage of development of the socialist society and the times for holding the congress and plenum with reports from members of the Politburo, and also about Article 6 of the Constitution. In this connection one generally gets the impression that all this is being done especially so that it will not be we communists who abolish Article 6 but the people's deputies, although the majority of communists are in favor of abolishing this article since it is not in keeping with the spirit of the times because the leading and directing force is confirmed by concrete actions and deeds. Since we are the ruling party today, we ourselves must suggest any changes to be made in the Constitution on the basis of a referendum in the party. Unfortunately, this has not been done, we are faced with reality, and the second congress will take place on 12 December.

Twice already at joint plenums we have expressed the idea of concretizing the program or perhaps drawing up two programs: A minimum program and a maximum program. Unfortunately this was not reflected. All this would make it possible to see both the longer range and the immediate task and also to clearly determine the platform of the Leningrad party organization for the elections. We have already discussed this but, unfortunately, we shall not have this platform in time for the elections.

Speaking about urgent tasks, there is some point in recalling the adoption of extraordinary measures for stabilizing the situation in trade in industrial goods and food products in Leningrad. I felt this very keenly when I was working for a month in the position of first secretary and met with the population and practically all social self-management committees. Today it is no longer a secret that up to 40% of the commodities are shipped outside the city. It would probably make sense not only to think about this, but also to take concrete steps to introduce either a card system or sale by invitation, since we cannot put up with this any longer.

There is another question—about benefits. I do not know about everyone else but the majority of those present in the hall and I personally am tired of hearing criticism about benefits and privileges enjoyed by the party workers. Let us instruct a work group made up of rank-and-file members of the party gorkom and oblast committee and let them speak on television after first having looked at the benefits we enjoy and tell the people what they are and what they are not. It might be simply that these benefits never existed.

There has already been criticism here about the fact that all of our proposed decisions are poorly monitored. I have a suggestion: Begin a regular program on television on which, perhaps under the aegis of the press center of the CPSU obkom, no less frequently than once a month members of one or another commission of the oblast or city party committees would speak. They would report on the results of the implementation of decrees, including our joint plenums about which, unfortunately, we have heard nothing, how they are being implemented, and the actions taken on those critical remarks that have been expressed here repeatedly.

Speaking about eliminating duplication in the work of the party obkom and gorkom, I think that it is unquestionably necessary to combine the positions of the first secretaries, but under one mandatory condition: We must also eliminate the duplicate units in the structure of the party obkom.

Zh.I. Alferov, USSR people's deputy

First of all, again, I would like to say a couple of words about the mass media. This has already been discussed but still I should like to emphasize once again their immense significance. But the following is important: There is no need to act with prohibitive measures.

We have become accustomed to being the ruling party, this is our party press, and the press is under all of our jurisdiction. Now the situation is different. Today the mass media and, above all, television are undoubtedly of great importance to us. But in order for them to work for us, we must not prohibit but search for talented people who can really work well, and above all in television. In particular the Leningrad scientific center has approached television to ask for scientific discussions on Wednesdays because we are qualified to speak objectively about many important things. We must do this. I do not think television will refuse us. But we must display maximum initiative.

Regarding Comrade Arefin's speech. I can tell you sincerely that I was very bitter. Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov is a pioneer of perestroyka. Even before it existed, in 1968, he formulated a great deal of what today are slogans and a banner for all of us. Excuse me, you said that Anatoliy Aleksandrovich Sobchak, our worthy representative to the Supreme Soviet at one time received money as a lawyer. I do not know of anyone who will work for nothing. We have many negative things in our press. But we must fight against them, I repeat again, not by prohibition but through active work.

In conclusion, two or three words about science and education. I listened to Goncharova's speech with a great deal of interest and attention. I think we should always remember the words of Vladimir Ilich Lenin that some day will come those remarkable times when there will be only three professions left, and he defined them as: Doctor, teacher, and engineer. He put the doctor in first place because he is responsible for our health, and the teacher—for our education. Science, education, and public health should not be under any kind of economic accountability. We in Leningrad should do everything we can in our program for these areas.

Journalists Offer Opinions on Draft Press Law

90US0274A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 7 Dec 89 p 1

[Editors' comments on the draft USSR Law on the Press and Other Mass Media: "I Have an Opinion!"]

[Text] In connection with publication of the draft Law on the Press, our column "I Have an Opinion!" requested the editors of a number of publications to give their opinion regarding the future law.

Boris Nikolskiy, chief editor of the magazine NEVA:

"The law is designed to provide people a real opportunity to freely express their point of view. It conforms to the concept of socialist pluralism.

Two competing trends were observed in the preparation of the draft Law on the Press: To consolidate existing practice or to take a significant step forward in the democratization of our press and mass media.

I believe the main achievement of the draft law consists of two fundamental principles: The repudiation of censorship, except of course for protecting state secrets in the press, and the registration—and not licensing—nature of the institution of publishing. Monopolization of the mass media is not permitted.

There is the danger, of course, that the law will not be able to function at full force for quite an extensive period of time, for the material-technical base in our country is very weak and is essentially monopolized. However, the Law on the Press and Other Mass Media should be

looked at in the context of the new state laws which are providing for democratic development of the economy and industry, of our market economy. With time, new opportunities will appear for the development of the material-technical base. Whatever 'impeding mechanisms' our bureaucracy has contrived to date, all the same the process of democratization of our entire life continues."

Vitaliy Ignatenko, chief editor of the magazine NOVOYE VREMYA:

"The letter and spirit of the Law on the Press presuppose a protection of pluralism of opinions and pluralism of publications. It is just this circumstance, however, which at times elicits protest from a certain portion of society. We hear warnings to the effect that journalists will enjoy universal rights and have no obligations, that freedom of the press, as it were, will lead to 'clique-formation' and 'repudiation of ideals.' We also hear assertions that freedom of the press will lead unavoidably to abuses. I am convinced that the Law on the Press will not only institutionalize mutual relations between the press and the public, but will also bury quite a number of moss-covered dogmas and acquired extraneous features. This is especially important for our colleagues in the local areas who are guided by principle.

My reply to opponents: The truth is structural. It is not an end in itself. Truth requires great responsibility on the part of journalists and must be based on a foundation of honesty, competence, and common sense. Juggling the facts and shifting emphasis, even for good purposes, is inappropriate. In my view, this is also envisaged in the draft law."

Yuriy Koberidze, editor of the newspaper SMENA, published in large editions:

"You see in the subhead of any large-edition newspaper the cumbersome headline—'Organ of the Administration, Party Committee, Trade-Union Committee, and VLKSM [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] Committee.' Somebody (apparently a long, long time ago, when there was only a small press) decided to raise by a level the famous proverb: 'One head is good, but four is better.' Better, but for whom? Without a doubt, for those whose oversight we fall under—who delay publication (and there was such an incident in the history of our news organ) and cut bonuses, or do not offer them at all. You can always find reasons for making such decisions. But with our scanty salaries and bonus system without honoraria, it is like a gulp of life-giving water. This is the reason for the impotence of many news organs.

This is why I fully agree with those deputies who have opposed the supposedly innocent corrections to Article 43, where someone has skirted two committees and introduced censorship hidden in cloudy wording, capable of fortifying the press against glasnost.

In general, at a time when enterprises are shifting to leasing and economic accountability, the founders of plant newspapers must be the enterprise collectives."

Yuriy Sovtsov, chief editor of the magazine RODINA:

"There are gaps in the draft. How will reader interests be observed? The interests of the people thanks to whom we in fact exist? Look—any conflicts which presently take place between editors and publishers or founders also flout the interests and rights of readers. When a reader subscribes to a newspaper or magazine, not the last thing in his mind is the individuality of the editor who directs publication, the policy he pursues, the ideas he fights for. Then he gets a surprise—a different editor is appointed.... Take our magazine for example. It was an all-union publication, but starting 1 January it will become all- Russian, the organ of the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. Well, they did not consult with us—fine. But what about the reader? If only they took a public opinion poll! Thus, the new law must stipulate the specific rights of readers.

Generally speaking, it is good that we have the draft. Now we will have a substantive discussion on our rights and obligations."

Ivan Panov, chief editor of the newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA:

"When I was elected people's deputy, my pre-campaign platform included the following point: 'The Law on the Press should not be a law against the press.' The present draft generally meets this position, primarily in its concept. I have had the occasion to participate in preparation of the draft law at various stages—in the Committee on Glasnost of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and in the USSR Union of Journalists. I hope the parliament will adopt the draft in its second reading. But the most important stage lies ahead, of course, when the law goes into effect in society and begins to operate. I think this will be a tremendously complex process."

Vitaliy Korotich, chief editor of the magazine OGONEK:

"To me the most alarming thing in the draft Law on the Press is the fact that, for reasons unknown, its adoption is again being postponed. The urgent necessity of such a law was declared by Lenin as long ago as the beginning of the revolution

In my opinion, the law should be discussed and adopted immediately, along with other matters of primary importance which for some reason did not get put on the agenda of the Second USSR Congress of People's Deputies.

It seems to me our bureaucracy has had several months to exert intensive pressure on glasnost. What is taking place today with a whole number of publications—from the central ARGUMENTY I FAKTY and OKTYABR to the Noginsk city and large-edition news organs—is extremely indicative. All revolutions have entailed a

strategic struggle for the post and telegraph services. I do not think the conservative forces of our country deserve the time for attack which is presently being extended to them.

My opinion: The Law on the Press and Other Mass Media should be on the agenda of the Congress of People's Deputies as one of the most important items for the continued life of the country. It is almost ready now, and we must not delay such an important matter."

Editors, Journalists Union Articles

90US0300A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 14 Dec 89 p 3

[Set of articles on the draft press law under the heading "Debate on the Freedom of the Press"]

[Text] **L. Goldin, Doctor of Philosophy**

Should We Be Afraid of the Small Press Run?

Two extremes have come together in the legal awareness of our society: The common conviction that a good law can solve acute problems all by itself, and at the same time a situation-based attitude toward legal acts based on common sense and an arbitrary interpretation of feasibility.

While having no doubt at all about the need to pass the Law on the Press, I believe at the same time that its uniform interpretation will not take hold in our society anytime soon. For a long time to come, there will be no dearth of people at the "top" and the "bottom" of the social hierarchy who will know precisely what the newspapers are to write about and how, and what the ideas and aspirations of the journalists should be. This is the subjective aspect of the issue; a lot depends in this matter on the development of political and spiritual culture, on self-awareness.

However, there are also objective factors which will bring their full weight to bear in the course of implementing the Law on the Press. No matter how progressive and democratic the goals and intent of the legislators are, material conditions determining the limits of what is possible at present are the main point. This is first of all the socio-political situation in society. However, this also means such mundane issues as paper, capacity of printing plants, means for obtaining information, dissemination of publications, financial support.... Freedom of the press is ensured not only by constitutional guarantees, the right being asserted in our society to freely express opinions, and access to information but also by technical and economic resources and potential which, alas, are very limited at present.

The contradiction between the level of spiritual freedom, variety of ideological positions and attitudes unprecedented in our history and conditions for the production and economic operation of the mass media is seriously affecting our society.

To my mind, the draft law pays insufficient attention to the real material conditions for the functioning of information organs. We can imagine a new flare-up of the newspaper and journal boom following the adoption of the law; however, it is absolutely unclear on the basis of what an increase in the number of publications is going to be attained. However, it is altogether necessary to look for ways to accomplish this task, or else the rights proclaimed will turn out to be illusory.

What does multimillion circulation testify to? Of course, first of all to bright materials and the skill of responding precisely to the interests of the public. However, this also means 10 potentially feasible publications with press runs of hundreds of thousands of copies. Therefore, given the shortage of paper and limited capacity of printing plants, it also means an opportunity to expand the spectrum of opinions and positions and to assert pluralism more completely. The unification of opinions is unavoidably exacerbated when a dozen sources of information and several, already household, names of writers, scientists, and essayists which ensure guaranteed attention by readers are there to see for sometimes the entire country. Under such circumstances, the influx of ideas is weakened, and many ideas do not get to be stated.

Editorial files of any popular magazine contain dozens of excellent articles, and any one of them can be published. However, there are only 12 issues a year. In the newspapers, the situation is no better. I recall a retort by a literary editor of a modest weekly who was looking drearily at a stack of letters which was 1.5 meters tall: "Could it be that we have a Bulgakov in there?"

We should take into account the fact that ours is the most "reading" but by far not the most "publishing" country. There are dozens of times more publications in the cities of the United States, Europe, and Japan comparable to that of our country in terms of population. It is not difficult to set up a new publication even with limited funds. (It is another matter that it is difficult to attain the status of a highly profitable publication and ensure extensive recognition in a competitive environment).

At one point, the publishing trade was very dynamic in our country as well. For example, by the end of the last century 21 publications were issued in the Russian, Ukrainian, and Bulgarian languages, Yiddish, and foreign languages in Odessa, whereas its population at the time was two times smaller. Periodicals in the first post-revolutionary years were also distinguished by their incalculable variety. It is very important that the draft stresses the inadmissibility of monopolizing the mass media. We should reinforce this provision of Article 6 and make it more specific.

The Law on the Press will make our publishing practices more varied. I think that several types of publications may assert themselves in our country. The first one is "the official publication," all kinds of "heralds" and

"bulletins." It is possible that these publications will call for subsidies on the part of the parent entities which establish the size of the press run. "Educational" and special-information small-size publications are the second kind. Their press runs should be determined by the readership demand. The scale of their circulation can be gigantic, as in the case of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY; however, publications addressed to a very narrow circle of readers are also feasible. The third type of publications should be regulated taking the "anti-monopoly" requirements into account. These are all "thick" journals, as well as the newspapers which are free from the "protocol." My intention is not at all to restrict the access to the ideas of NOVYY MIR, OGONEK, or a popular newspaper. However, what is so bad about the orientation of social thought represented by the "sovereigns of ideas" being also developed by their brethren in ideology? After all, in this case a given school of thought will even be reinforced because present-day editorial offices obviously lack "page space," and voices of many authors, even those "on our own team," go unheard.

For example, I can conceive of the concerns or syndicates of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, IZVESTIYA, OGONEK (even with a video channel), SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, iternational consortiums MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI and NOVOYE VREMYA, some association based on NASH SOVREMENNIK and MOLODAYA GVARDIYA, and so on engaging in most varied forms of activity.

In addition, the formation of new publications at the expense of reducing press runs will make it possible to find the target audience with more precision, and achieve more complete correspondence with its interests. At present, magazines use extensively "the right of the first conjugal night," jacking up the press runs for this reason and advertising bestsellers during the subscription campaign. Meanwhile, the reader will be more eager to buy a book publication, even of the very modest printing standard, but without the accompanying "set" of materials in the journal which are not necessarily of interest to him.

We should destroy the stereotype according to which a small press run bespeaks some kind of social unsoundness of a publication and lack of recognition. There are, to my mind, original and interesting journals—VEK XX I MIR, ISSKUSTVO KINO, GORIZONT, as well as some publications in the Baltic area—which have come to play a worthy role in current spiritual life even given their small volume and low (by our standards) number of subscribers.

Many new official and informal structures are now insistently demanding public representation. A society should know the frame of mind of all categories of its fellow citizens. This issue is being vigorously discussed in the course of the parliamentary debate on the press law. On the other hand, no institutions and organizations have been given the right to exist forever. This is also what the fate of publications should be—they should be born without hindrance and "die" when the time comes thus freeing up the space for new initiatives.

It is no secret that at present the attention of the public is focused on the opposition of the two main schools of social thought. However, no matter how fascinating it is to follow the duels of various publications we should acknowledge that these polemics do not exhaust all the alternatives of our existence. May each voice be heard. At present, newspapers and magazines which have a countenance different from the general one sometimes timidly conceal their affiliation with a "school." Attempting to avoid rebukes for restricting pluralism and being biased, they are forced to open their pages for the expression of positions alien to them. What is such artificial objectivity for? After all, at present nobody claims to have the ultimate truth. Even if a particular "deviation" emerges it will be evened out by the unfettered expression of alternative points of view. As far as the limits for the printed word which are necessary in a civilized society are concerned, they will be set forth in the Law on the Press.

We should also take into account socio-psychological factors associated with the opportunity for self-expression in journalism. Stating one's views and proposals is an acute personal need for a person with a keen vision of the world and a resolute civic position. It is known that some authors (and not just graphomaniacs) are even prepared to publish at their own expense, without expecting to be compensated for the outlay in the future. Vanity and an exaggerated notion of the significance of one's ideas are not the point here. The written word organizes consciousness more than the spoken word; it is a healing influence on the author, at times akin to a catharsis. At any rate, one grasps the complexity and contradictory nature of the problem under discussion more profoundly while sitting at his desk than in the reckless, frequently deafening spontaneity of a meeting where, contrary to the widespread notion, you rarely manage to really hear the opponent and evaluate your own arguments self-critically. It is instructive that many ranking leaders, professionals, and social activists who are prepared to talk and lecture for hours on end, day or night, are helpless in front of a blank sheet of paper which makes it plain that, essentially, they have nothing to say.

I believe that many ideas which are now heard in the squares would have quickly exhausted the number of their adherents had they been the subject of an in-depth discussion in the press. One cannot fail to notice that, as a rule, even the adherents of radical views mobilize their intellectual potential, enrich their knowledge, and give more thought to being argumentative and responsible when they contribute to a newspaper or a magazine. Our parliamentary debates would also be more constructive and intellectual if the problems discussed were given an extensive preliminary "road test" in the press.

On the other hand, at times no criticism ensures the same effect as the self-exposure of an obscurantist, a

lumpen-essayist. The reflection of even the extreme positions in the press may sadden some people, but not me. When the reader sometimes says about such views: "This is really the worst extreme" we should take into account that, as a rule, the issue is considerably more acute in real life. The press is called upon to report on this, performing its social function and thus mobilizing social forces for a response. The public has not only the right, but the responsibility to know completely the frame of mind and intentions of its fellow citizens.

We should not underestimate the acuity of the problem touched upon here. Publication difficulties are frequently used as a pretext for extremist appeals. The methods of solving the problem proposed by those "wronged"—elbowing away some people so that there is more space for others—are quite in line with the notions of fair redistribution of sausage, soap, and living space which a part of our fellow citizens considers to be a panacea for all of our troubles. Should we, perhaps, start distributing vouchers for the right to publish as well? Poverty is the reason for both our shortages and the ways to overcome them. However, something needs to be done without waiting for our paper and other rations to be enriched.

Ayvar Zile, editor of the publication ZEME, Riga

How Is the Law to Be Protected

The draft of the new law shows that our society has finally grasped that the freedom of the press is not a privilege of the journalists but an inalienable right of the people. Certainly, not everything in this document is perfect; some things need to be worked on additionally. However, the very appearance of the document makes us optimistic: Previously, a law like that was only discussed within a narrow circle.

Our newspaper ZEME ("Land") is now preparing to publish its first issue. This will be a commercial publication of the Union of Agrarians of Latvia which is fully independent from the economic point of view. We hope that the newspaper will be not only an adviser to the farmer and the lessee on all issues of interest to him but also a reliable assistant. ZEME will familiarize the readers with the most up-to-date achievements of agricultural science, technology, and techniques and will assist in getting in touch with their owners, finalizing a purchasing and selling transaction, signing a contract, and so on.

We want our journalists to make good money; this is why all of them will become members of a joint-stock company publishing the newspaper. We intend to set up the business in such a manner that the stock of a talented journalist who dedicates himself entirely to creative pursuits will go up, and not at all figuratively. We also want to secure publishing rights so as to be able to publish brochures and other advertising products, various booklets, and we are planning to enter the international publishing market.

Dreams, dreams.... Frankly speaking, thus far we have had hardly any opportunity to fulfill them. The draft law gives us more self-confidence as well.

Unfortunately, this document is not immune to the typical shortcoming of a majority of our laws: It **lacks its own defense mechanism.** In the absence of this, it can be just ignored by those for whom it is not advantageous. After all, this happens frequently. Let the lawyers give it some thought. Personally, I believe that an article to the effect that **individuals guilty of violating the law, restricting the freedom of the press, concealing from society information which is necessary for its dynamic operation may be charged under the administrative and criminal law** should be added to the last chapter. People's courts should render verdicts in such matters.

Ivan Spodarenko, editor of the newspaper SILSKI VISTI, Kiev

Not a Level Field

Apparently, I am not the only one to be surprised by the ending of Article 43 of the draft law—the amount of indemnities for moral damage the total of which "in every single case cannot exceed 50,000 rubles." Why not 1 million or 100 rubles? Where did this monstrous total fine come from? Let us agree that even the most talented author is not in a position to pay this sum. If it remains in the law then we will not be too far from the time when editorial offices simply fall apart, and their authors take up other occupations. I believe that this applies to rayon newspapers, as well as to republic newspapers, say, such as ours, which has the largest circulation in the Ukraine, 2.4 million copies, as well as any central newspaper. One might think that all the journalists ever do is inflict moral damage on the subjects of their materials. Mistakes do happen. However, is there a dearth of those who persecute and morally destroy journalists, and not by mistake at all? Who will indemnify us for this damage?

Strangely, the draft says nothing about those who keep trying to unjustifiably refute critical writings by slandering the journalists and besmirching their reputation in the courts. Is it that "our denying friends" will carry on their sinister business with impunity? Is this fair? Is this legal? This is not a level field.

I propose to definitely take this into account and insert the words **"the amount of monthly wages of the author or 500 rubles"** after "to exceed" instead of the "50,000 rubles," and to definitely insert a point on defending the person of the journalist envisaging penalties for those who inflict moral damage on him.

V. Potemkin, SOVETSKAYA KULTURA correspondent, Leningrad

"They Say That...."

Understandably, when glasnost is in short supply the rumor mill works full tilt, and people live by rumors. Where did the rumor originate this time about "The

Fifth Wheel" being closed down? Perhaps, a stereotype was at work here: If it is a sharp program they will definitely ban it.... However, it is not that easy to do at present. This is why no matter how many sharp broadcasts "The Fifth Wheel" puts on the air, no matter how many commissions they dispatch to the Leningrad TV station, no matter how much they check the subordinates and recheck the management, "the wheel" keeps rolling.

Perhaps, the myth on the closure of "The Fifth Wheel" originated spontaneously, after the live broadcast, when Editor in Chief of the Chief Editorial Office of Artistic Broadcasting B. Kurkova talked to Deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet Doctor of Legal Sciences Professor A. Sobchak who spoke quite sharply about the recent meeting in Leningrad and criticized the party leadership of the city.

So what? Naturally, the broadcast was criticized at the session of the Leningrad City Soviet. However, plurality of opinions is also gaining its right to exist. As I have learned, nobody intends to persecute the editorial staff of "The Fifth Wheel" and its journalists for having their own point of view. Still, they say that....

From Glasnost to the Freedom of Speech

A couple days ago, a meeting of the aktiv of the Moscow chapter of the USSR Union of Journalists discussed the draft Law on the Press and Other Mass Media. Today we present to our readers proposals for the draft law set forth by the participants in the meeting in their open letter to the USSR people's deputies.

In recent years, says this document, all of us have grasped that the freedom of speech and freedom of the press are not only a necessary prerequisite for the activities of the mass media, but also a necessary prerequisite for the normal existence of society, the natural right of every person and citizen to know the truth, openly discuss everything happening in the country and in the world, develop his own opinion about all events, and voice their views without hindrance and in public. This is the point of departure for the draft law adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet in the first reading and published for a public discussion. In cases like this, listening to the opinion of journalists themselves would be in order.

The abolition of censorship proclaimed in Article 1 is the main advantage of the draft law. However, **the amendment to Article 42** proposed by a group of deputies **in essence nullifies Article 1 of the law** because it proclaims that the provision set forth in it does not apply to "procedures established by the law...." It is not known which procedures these are and who establishes them. This provides an opportunity for the display of unrestricted bureaucratic creativity.

It is necessary to abolish the Glavlit [Main Administration for Safeguarding State Secrets in the Press], the heritage of Stalin, which is incompatible with the notion of free speech. In a majority of civilized countries, the practice of preliminary endorsement of texts meant to be published does not exist.

It is extremely important to defend the right of individual citizens of the USSR to set up mass media which is what **an amendment to Point 1 of Article 6** submitted by the same group of autonomous deputies is directed against.

More clarity is needed in Article 7 on the registration of mass media. The draft proposes that an organization "in charge of the issues of publishing activities, TV and radio broadcasting," along with the local soviets, be given a decisive say. In turn, the journalists believe that the right to resolve the issues of registration should be given exclusively to the soviets of people's deputies. Otherwise, it will be impossible to overcome the departmental and group egoism, and even the striving of entrenched associations and structures to suppress a possible competitor. This is identical with giving the monopolist, the State Committee for the Press, the right to control the fortunes of its competitor.

A serious contradiction is contained in the outwardly innocuous **Article 15 on the parent entity (publisher).** It is necessary to enter into a contractual relationship with a publishing house or "another corporate person," already existing and recognized by the authorities, in order to take advantage of the right to publish a press organ and obtain a registration certificate. Thus, the opportunity to publish press organs is restricted for individual citizens. The dependence on the parent entity (publisher) is codified through the requirement to provide "guarantees of material, technical, and financial support for the operation of the mass media." The sad experience of the 1988 subscription campaign proves convincingly that no existing publication in our country can provide such guarantees, even a publication with millions of subscribers.

The article on the parent entity and publisher should be reconciled with article 6 which it entirely contradicts in its present form. It is necessary to give journalists equal rights with the parent entities of the mass media in everything that involves developing and adopting editorial statutes, work rules, and determining the orientation of the publication. Their mutual relations should proceed from the principle of common convictions rather than dictates and imposition of the will of the parent entities.

In addition, **the law should ensure the right of labor collectives to manage at their discretion a segment of profits** determined by the joint contract (of the collective and the publisher). This is necessary in order to create normal conditions for working creatively and meeting social needs.

The draft **does not give equal rights to journalists and to citizens collecting damages for the actions of the mass media.** Article 32 says: "Releasing information on the private life of a citizen without his consent is not allowed

if this information is not socially significant." If the court does not recognize a given piece of information to be socially significant the citizen may sue for the moral damage of "up to 50,000 rubles." (Article 43). This situation poses the threat of an economic rout of any press organ undesirable for the authorities because no clear criteria for information which is socially significant exist.

The guilty party should be financially responsible for disrupting the publication of a periodical, for banning the publication of materials, i.e., for destroying the results of intellectual labor. Its liability should be from its own pocket rather than from the state coffers.

Participants in the meeting expressed their hope that in the course of the second review of the draft law the deputies will take into account the point of view of not only numerous and varied readers but also of journalists who have to solve one and the same problem daily (and often to the detriment of glasnost): How to clear the way for the freedom of speech through a barricade of restrictive bans.

New Newspapers, Radio Station Launched

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA

LD0101132390 Moscow TASS in English 1316 GMT 1 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow January 1 TASS—Several new newspapers and a radio station were launched in the Soviet Union on the first day of 1990.

In Moscow, a new Soviet newspaper RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, (Workers Tribune) hit the stands on Monday. Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev wished its staff success, saying that the paper should serve the needs of the working people, follow the principled party line and know and protect people's interests.

The Russian city of Tambov renewed the publication of its city newspaper when 16,000 copies of the first eight-page issue were circulated here on Monday.

The paper is published by Tambov's 14 largest enterprises, research institutes and colleges. The first issue focused on the problems of perestroyka and social justice in the city.

The first city newspaper was published in Tambov by the great Russian poet Gavriil Derzhavin, who was city governor in the late 18th century. The Tambsov IZVESTIYA, as the paper was then called, was a huge success with local residents at the time.

A new radio station, "Novaya Volna" (New Wave), began its broadcasts in Novosibirsk, in Siberia, with a New Year music fiesta.

The station will broadcast five-hours of stereo music daily.

The new service plans to foucs on local social problems and morals, and aims to popularise best works in literature, music and drama.

It will also broadcast in German, Ukrainian, Kazakh and Tatar.

Novaya Volna was founded by the local TV and radio committee, the Novosibirsk Centennial Fund, the Sibgiproshakht Institute and the Konsultant Centre.

Subscribers in the Ukrainian city of Zholtiye Vody received the first copies of the new ROBOCHAYA TRIBUNA (Workers Tribune) newspaper. It is published by the city party committee and Council of People's Deputies and will be put out four times a week. Dnepropetrovsk region, where Zholtiye Vody is situated, has 30 newspapers with a combined circulation of more than one million copies.

Gorbachev Sends Congratulations

LD3112124389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 31 Dec 89

[Text] Tomorrow the first issue of the new newspaper RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA is coming out. Comrade Gorbachev has congratulated its readers, writers, and the editing and publishing team. It is important that from the pages of RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, the message stresses, the voice of the working man sounds freely, that his interests become the newspaper's line; that it works for the consolidation of the sound forces of society, for interaction and cooperation between all the social groups in the name of the common weal.

PRAVDA Changes Look

AU0101115390 Paris AFP in English 1135 GMT 01 Jan 90

[Text] Moscow, Jan 1 (AFP)—The Soviet Communist Party paper PRAVDA changed its look for the new year with a bigger masthead and a portrait of Lenin on the front page.

The first edition of a new paper, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, or Labor Tribune, which will be under the control of the party's Central Committee, appeared on news stands Monday, with a message of congratulations from Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. Its news staff comes mostly from two dailies that closed down after publishing their last editions Sunday, SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA (Socialist Industry) and STROYITELNAYA GAZETA (The Construction Gazette).

New Newspaper in Stavropol

LD0101183690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 1 Jan 90

[Excerpts] Public interest in the printed word is enormous and its authority is higher than ever before. [passage omitted] A new newspaper, VECHERNYIY

STAVROPOL, acquaints the people of Stavropol with the freshest of news. Its first issue was published today. It is being published by the town party committee and the town soviet of people's deputies. [passage omitted]

Art Awards Presented by 'Prizes Commission'

17 Authors Honored

LD2912221789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 29 Dec 89

[from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] Diplomas and prize-winners' badges were awarded today to the authors of the 17 works of literature, art, and architecture which were considered by the Prizes Commission of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Council of Ministers Presidium to be the best in the artistic sense, and, of no lesser importance, which touch on the most topical problems of Russia today.

Aleksandr Vladimirovich Vlasov, chairman of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers presented the awards. [passage omitted] [video shows vlasov presenting awards]

Vlasov Presents Awards

PM0201150190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 30 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Prizes Presented"]

[Text] The presentation of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] State prizes in the field of literature, art, and architecture took place in Moscow 29 December. Representatives of state and public organizations and figures of culture gathered for the ceremony in the RSFSR House of Soviets.

A.V. Vlasov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, presented diplomas and honorary badges to the winners. On behalf of the CPSU Central Committee, the Central Committee Russian bureau, and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers, he cordially congratulated the new winners, whose creative contribution to the development of Soviet culture has met with a high assessment and merited recognition.

Learning to live and work under conditions of democracy, glasnost, and the pluralism of opinions—today these are the party's practical slogans in the sphere of society's spiritual life, the speaker noted. Here the influence and authority of literature and art are simply inestimable. It will be correct to say that the success of revolutionary perestroyka, the breaking down of the old, and the creation of the new largely depend on the creative intelligentsia's unremitting activity.

Of course, it would be wrong and even Utopian to demand that literature and art give an immediate and highly artistic interpretation of our complex present-day reality. At the same time we cannot keep quiet about how in some places creative potential is still being expended more on noisy and verbose debates and sometimes is spent on self-serving and mutual insults.

The speaker stressed that at the same time life leaves no one any time for hesitation. A Leninist spirit of impartial assertion of the truth and the humanist values of socialism and an artistic quest according with the dimension of the revolutionary transformations are more important than ever in artistic creation now.

The chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers said that in general the works of the new winners mainly accord with these strict criteria put forward by life itself. They arouse in readers, viewers, and listeners bright feelings, optimism, and respect for every people and every national culture.

In conclusion A.V. Vlasov expressed the certainty that the artistic intelligentsia of the multinational RSFSR will help the party and people with even greater vigor to resolve the important tasks at the new stage of the socialist fatherland's development.

The representatives of the creative unions congratulated the new winners on the high assessment of their labor. The laureates expressed thanks for the high assessment of their activity and gave assurances that they will give all their efforts and talent to serving the Motherland.

TV Opinion Poll Views National Situation

LD3112204189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 31 Dec 89

[From the "Seven Days" program Presented by Eduard Sagalayev; date, place not given—live or recorded]

[Text] Two Congress of People's Deputies are already behind us. We have become more mature by two congresses. From feelings of emotion and expectation of a miracle, we are moving to an understanding of the realities. Here is some data from the latest all-union research. Thousands of people were polled. Thirty-seven percent consider the situation in the country verging on critical, and 31 percent regard it as a crisis situation. Up to 63 percent of those polled are dissatisfied with the deputies' efforts to stabilize the socioeconomic situation in the country. Furthermore, 35 people out of every 100 admitted that their hopes and expectations of the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet had on the whole not been met, while 49 said they had been met in part. Seventy-nine percent of those who talked to the sociologists were satisfied only with the draft law on pensions; 82 percent of those polled attribute the greatest significance to stepping up the fight against organized crime. The level of hopes in the party and the congress are 59 and 60 percent respectively. Confidence in the All-Union

Komsomol Central Committee, ministries, departments, and informal movements is extremely low.

This is all as it should be. I would like, however, to add my own point of view to these percentages. In my opinion, never in the history of mankind has a country's supreme legislative organ done what the Second Congress of People's Deputies did. The Americans, who had a hard time going through the Vietnam syndrome, did not do it. Thank goodness, we had courage and honesty enough to take two great and wise steps: To withdraw troops from Afghanistan, and publicly and officially to condemn the criminal action of our leaders, uninvited and unloved as they were. These two steps were steps out of the darkness and horror into light and truth.

Foreign Ministry Official Discussess Human Rights

LD2312101489 Moscow TASS in English 1404 GMT 22 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 22 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Konstantin Voitsekhovich:

The year 1989 saw considerable headway in the resolution of humanitarian issues in the Soviet Union, a Soviet Foreign Ministry official said.

Yuriy Reshetov, head of the ministry's Directorate for International Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights, told TASS that improvements in the humanitarian sphere depend on "how fast laws meeting international standards are passed in the Soviet Union."

A number of such laws—on exit from and entry to the Soviet Union, on freedom of conscience and religious organizations and on the press and mass media—have already been drafted.

The criminal code and the code of criminal procedure will also be amended.

Questioned about the need for a death penalty for certain crimes, Reshetov said "it is necessary, in the final account, to seek its full annulment."

He described the recent reinstatement of the Soviet Psychiatrists' Society in the World Psychiatric Association as a symbol of positive change.

However, he noted, "only the first few steps have been made in this sphere so far."

Reshetov called for radical improvements in the Soviet legislation on psychiatry, for glasnost in psychiatric activities and for an end to the monoply of one professional organisation in this sphere. These changes would help ensure a better protection of clients' interests."

The official also favoured the establishment of independent psychiatric commissions to consider "disputable issues concerning patients' forced therapy."

Reshetov spoke about the need to change the existing passport regime in the country. He said the solution of this problem is hampered by a number of "objective difficulties" connected with housing, employment, food supplies and health services.

"The current system used to resolve the issue of permanent residence does not take into account real problems but replaces their solution with a bureaucratic mechanism," he said.

In Reshetov's view, residency requirements for the participation in elections, introduced in some Baltic republics, "are at variance with international documents. They specifically contradict the international convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination."

Speaking about the international aspect of the Soviet humanitarian policy, the official said the Soviet side "recognises the importance of the activity of national and international human rights organisations."

On the idea of creating "single European legal space", Reshetov said it should be based on international universal norms.

He also did not rule out the possibility of the Soviet Union's participation in West European conventions on human rights.

Ukrainian Catholics Charged with Strong-Arm Tactics

90UN0397A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 19 Nov 89 p 3

[RATAU report: "Appeal of the Bishops of the Ukrainian Exarchate"]

[Text]The bishops of the Ukrainian exarchate have stated their desire to make a significant contribution to the upsurge in the religious life of Orthodox believers in the Ukraine, and to this end, of making use of the opportunities being opened up for the church by perestroyka, the development of glasnost, and the process of democratization in all spheres of Soviet society. Gathering in Kiev on 15 November they issued an epistle to the Orthodox clergy and monastic orders and all believers. The bishops called on the clergy to show special concern for the spiritual state of their flock and to activate parochial life, regarding the unity of believers as the apple of their eye.

The appeal states that in order to satisfy the spiritual needs of believers religious literature and ecclesiastical articles will be sent immediately to the parishes, and extensive influence will be exercised to develop national culture and the devotional customs and traditions of the Ukrainian people.

While emphasizing the generally positive development of the activity of the Orthodox Church, at the same time the hierarchy points to a number of complex problems that are today shaking and affecting some dioceses. Sowing enmity and dissension in peaceful parochial life.

The appeal recalls certain events of the recent past in the western districts of the Ukrainian exarchate. In particular, on 29 October Catholics of the Eastern Rite forcibly seized the Church of the Transfiguration in Lvov, belonging to the Ukrainian Orthodox Exarchate, and prevented divine worship. The Greek-Catholics, armed with metal objects set up a round-the-clock watch in the captured cathedral. They demanded that the Father Superior hand over the keys of the church, threatening the use of physical force. The Greek-Catholics taunted the Orthodox people and drove them out of the cathedral by force, and they mocked the Orthodox sacred objects.

We believe that this act of violence may lead to open enmity and bloodshed on religious grounds, the bishops warn in their appeal.

Similar instances of forcible seizure of Orthodox churches by Catholics of the Eastern Rite have also occurred in some other populated points in the Lvov diocese. At the request of Orthodox parishioners, the law enforcement agencies have opened criminal cases against persons committing these unlawful acts.

Another instance of the disturbance of ecclesiastical unity is also cited. On 22 October the former bishop of Zhitomir, the Right Reverend Ioann proclaimed the "Ukrainian Autocephalous Apostolic Orthodox Church of the Greek Orthodox Rite" and himself as its "First Hierarchical." He later reported to the Moscow patriarchy that he was withdrawing from the hierarchy of the Russian Orthodox Church. On 14 November the Holy Synod unfrocked Bishop Ioann. All religious ceremonies that he conducts after this are considered invalid, and his ecclesiastical instructions unlawful.

Our church was and is multinational, the appeal states. Accordingly, it is natural for it to indoctrinate its own children in the spirit of good will toward all nations and the followers of other beliefs and religions.

In conclusion, appealing to the clergy and to Orthodox believers, the archbishops called on them to be more active in parochial life, cherish the Orthodox faith, and strive for peace and understanding among people.

The appeal was signed by the metropolitan of Kiev and Galitskiy, the Patriarch of the Exarchate of All Ukraine, the metropolitans of Odessa and Kherson, Kharkov and Bogodukhovskiy, Simferopol and the Crimea, and Vinnitsa and Bratslavskiy, together with six archbishops and seven bishops.